

## BULLETIN

OF THE

# INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY CONGRESS

ASSOCIATION  
(ENGLISH EDITION)

[ 385. (06 .112 ]

## FOURTEENTH SESSION

Lucerne, 23 - 28 June 1947

## GENERAL PROCEEDINGS

### 3rd Section : WORKING

## INAUGURAL MEETING

June 25th, 1947, at 9.30 a. m.

PROVISIONAL CHAIRMAN : Mr. GOURSAT,

VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSION OF THE ASSOCIATION.

— The Meeting opened at 9.30 a.m.

The Chairman (in French). — In the name of the Permanent Commission I am entrusted to preside over the inaugural meeting of the third section.

The Permanent Commission has proposed as President of the Section :

Dr. G. C. PALMIERI, Engineer, Conseiller d'Administration of the Italian State Railways. (*Applause.*)

To constitute the Bureau of the Section, I will suggest to elect as Vice-Presidents :

Mr. G. F. H. GIESBERGER, Director General of the Netherlands Railways;

and Ing. P. F. A. DE BRION, Deputy Director of the Portuguese Railway Company.

As Principal Secretary, I will propose: Mr. E. VOORDECKER, Principal Engineer of the Belgian National Railways.

— *These proposals were unanimously agreed.*

— The Section on the suggestion of the President then elected the remaining officials and drew up a provisional agenda.

The President (in French). — I will now ask Mr. PALMIERI to take the chair. I am sure that under his direction this

Section will come to useful and precise conclusions which will help the Railways to struggle against the difficulties which the forthcoming years will bring forward

in questions concerning the importance of mileage for the service of passengers.

— Mr. PALMIERI then took over the Chair and the meeting was interrupted.

---

## Revision of the Rules and Regulations of the International Railway Congress Association.

---

— The meeting was resumed a few minutes later.

The President (in French). — Before we undertake our work it remains for me to welcome you.

I am convinced that with your co-operation, our labours will produce satisfactory results, and that our conclusions will establish a reliable basis which will give to the Railway Administrations useful information to help them to take further decisions.

Before dealing with Question III, I must ask you to elect a delegate to the Special Committee who will examine the proposed modifications to the Rules and

Regulations of the Association. The proposed alterations refer to Art. 17 relating to the amount of member subscriptions.

(*The proposed modifications were read out.*) (\*)

The President (in French). — I suggest to nominate for this purpose Prof. N. LALONI, Chief of the Commercial and Traffic Department of the Italian State Railways. (*Applause.*)

— *The Section then begin the examination of Question III.*

---

(\*) See wording of the proposed alterations in the August 1947 number of this *Bulletin*, page 803 (Summary of Proceedings Lucerne Congress 1947).

### QUESTION III.

**As regards passenger traffic, to report on the best policy for the organisation of the train services from the points of view of frequency and composition of trains, to ensure successful transport at the lowest possible cost, whilst giving passengers reasonable facilities.**

**To consider in turn the cases of steam and electric lines, showing the extent of using steam trains and railcars for the former, and electric motor coaches and electrically driven trains for the latter, on lines with heavy, average, and light traffic, during and outside rush hours of the day.**

---

#### Preliminary documents.

Report (Belgium and Colony, Bulgaria, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France and Colonies, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Netherlands and Colonies, Poland, Portugal and Colonies, Roumania, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Turkey and Jugoslavia), by M. LORRIOT. (See *Bulletin*, January 1947, p. 29, or separate issue No. 4.)

Report (America, Great Britain, Domi-

nions, Protectorates and Colonies, India, China and Egypt), by R. J. HARVEY. (See *Bulletin*, January 1947, p. 17, or separate issue No. 3.)

Supplement to report by M. Lorriot. (See *Bulletin*, May 1947, p. 551.)

Special Reporter. Mr. E. F. Baron VAN HAERSOLTE. (See *Bulletin*, April 1947, p. 501.)

### DISCUSSION BY THE SECTION.

---

#### Meeting held on the 25th June 1947.

---

Dr. G. C. PALMIERI, ENGINEER, IN THE CHAIR.

---

**The President (in French).** — Gentlemen, we will start the examination of Question III. I beg the delegates who will take part in the discussion to indicate their registration number to avoid errors and facilitate the drafting of the Minutes.

Question III is as follows :

As regards passenger traffic, to report on the best policy for the organisation of the train services from the points of view of frequency and composition of trains, to ensure successful transport at the lowest possible cost, whilst giving passengers reasonable facilities.

To consider in turn the cases of steam and electric lines, showing the extent of using steam trains and railcars for the former, and electric motor coaches and electrically driven trains for the latter, on lines with heavy, average and light traffic, during and outside rush hours of the day.

Gentlemen, one has to consider the technical side to ensure the maximum comfort, and speed of the passenger services, but it is also essential that the Administrations should consider the running cost. It has been noted a tendency to augment services without counting the cost.

One is asked therefore to consider the technical aspect and the financial aspect of the question.

Question III has been studied with great competence by the Reporters Mr. LORRIOT and Mr. Ranald J. HARVEY.

The Special Reporter, Baron E. F. VAN HAERSOLTE has been charged to summarise the conclusions of the two reporters and he has done this work with his well known competence.

Therefore, I call upon Mr. VAN HAERSOLTE to give a resumé of the studies of the two reporters.

**Mr. van Haersolte, Special Reporter** (in French). — You have all read the reports of Messrs. LORRIOT and HARVEY, also my special report. Before opening the discussion, I am just going to name the four points into which I divided the report :

1. Revalorisation of passenger fares.
2. Drastic limitation of the regular passenger services judged in conjunction with :
  - a) reasonable service,
  - b) new methods of routing the trains.

3. Reducing the weight of the passenger rolling stock.

4. Staggering of traffic peaks.

**The President (in French).** — Before commencing the discussion of these points I ask if anyone has a suggestion to make ?

**Mr. Colle, Belgian National Railways** (in French). — We have read with the greatest interest the reports prepared by Mr. LORRIOT and Mr. HARVEY. We must congratulate them on having made so complete an investigation, and in having placed before us reports which throw so much light upon the question.

So far as the Belgian Railways are concerned, we have already put into practice a great part of the recommendations and advices brought forward in Mr. LORRIOT's report, and the results obtained from the financial point of view may be considered as most encouraging.

Although we had 117 % of the passenger-kilometres of 1938, and have had only 70 % of train-kilometres during the corresponding period in 1945, with that 70 % we can assume that the service gives to the passengers the possibility of satisfactory travel.

Basing myself on this experience which is confined to steam traction, I propose that the Meeting should take as a basis of discussion the various conclusions come to, as set forth in Mr. LORRIOT's report and modifying them as may be found necessary; these summaries are resumed in a note which may be handed to the delegates.

**Dr. Wang, Chinese Ministry of Communications, China.** — I wish to support Mr. COLLE's proposal.

**The President** (in French). — I agree to take as the base of the discussion the conclusions of Mr. COLLE and examine them point by point. If there is no objection, we will pass on to an examination of the summaries. (*Assent.*)

Here is the text of the first point of these summaries :

#### *Summary 1.*

The passenger fares should be revalorised as nearly as possible to the level of those operating in 1913.

If passenger fares were too low the Railway Administrations, having the balancing of their budget in mind, would be forced to an excessive curtailment of their trains with the risk of depriving their clientele of indispensable facilities, or to increase the goods rates, which would render them particularly vulnerable to road competition.

**Mr. COLLE** do you think the scope of your proposal should be widened ?

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — I think that the opening sentence : « Passenger fares... » makes the stand we wish to take sufficiently clear. We want to know if the idea expressed meets with everyone's approval; perhaps it is a little too vague and should be made more definite. Are there any delegates who wish to say anything about this ?

**Mr. Laloni, Italian State Railways, Italy** (in French). — Mr. COLLE has proposed that we examine the summaries he prepared based on Mr. LORRIOT's report. Before we begin the discussion I would like to know if the receipts mentioned in Mr. LORRIOT's report relate to all the traffic or to passenger traffic, and if the cost of free travel and cheap fares has been taken into account. Before dealing with increases in the rates, it is neces-

sary to determine the different elements of which the receipts are composed, if cheap fares or other reductions are included. We must also know the ratio of the passenger receipts to the total receipts.

**Mr. Lorriot, Reporter** (in French). — The figures given in Chapter I of my report give the percentage of passenger receipts in the total receipts. These percentages were obtained by taking the whole of the passenger receipts, which cover both ordinary fares and cheap fares. Free travel was not taken into account as no sufficiently accurate statistics concerning this were available. I think this answers the point raised.

**Mr. van Haersolte** (in French). — The question is closely connected with the first summary. In discussing the question of revalorisation, it is necessary to state, after having integrated the passenger receipts, if the fares are to be increased to bring them in line with the cost of transport. To do so, it is necessary to decide what proportion of the receipts is attributable to the passenger traffic.

**Mr. Ranjit Singh, Indian Government Railways.** — Very briefly the Indian Government Railways find that the question of increased passenger fares as against goods rates has meant a decline in traffic and rehabilitation, but one of the very important factors we are faced with is public opinion against the increase of fares in view of the fact that conditions of travel are not improving. In other words, if you are to increase the passenger fares you must give better facilities in order to maintain the good will of the travelling public.

**Mr. Colle.** — We must make the scope of summary 1 more precise. In the enunciation of the question it is stated that reasonable facilities should be provided at a lower cost. If the rates are not revalorised to some extent, the technical services can only give such facilities at great financial loss. The rates must therefore be revised.

Those who have already done so, find it all to the good. The others must find some means of giving the public additional satisfaction, and this is precisely revalorisation which does not mean « increasing » but « restoring the value » they previously had.

**The President (in French).** — The question is stated sufficiently clearly in the Summary we are considering. It says : « The passenger fares should be revalorised as nearly as possible to the level of those operating in 1913. » As Mr. COLLE has pointed out, it does not state that the rates in force in 1913 should be increased. In fact it is said that « the tendency should be to approach as nearly as possible... ».

I am not overlooking the fact that the present day services are not entirely satisfactory for the public, since nearly every country has suffered on account of the war. But the public are always asking for more and more, regardless of cost. The Administrations however cannot overlook the financial aspect of the question, and in this connection there is a certain limit beyond which we must not go. As Mr. COLLE has reminded us, technical improvement becomes impossible if the necessary funds are not available.

I think that taking into account the demands of the public and the difficul-

ties the different countries have to face, the policy of the Administrations should be to endeavour to bring the fares into line with those current in 1913 as far as this is possible, so that the Technical Services will be able to make such improvements as will give the public reasonable facilities.

I am of the opinion that the proposed wording is acceptable. It expresses the guiding principle very well.

**Mr. Colle (in French).** — In the same order of ideas, I would add that « revalorisation » of the rates does not mean making the passenger services show a profit. But they should not be run at such a loss that the goods rates have to be increased to balance receipts and expenses, which as Mr. LORRIOT very rightly points out encourages road competition.

We must provide reasonable services at the lowest possible cost.

**Mr. Laloni (in French).** — As I have stated I agree with the question in principle. I would like however to go back to the phrase concerning the revalorisation of the fares. In the reports mention is made of the 1913 fares, and it is stated that we should go back to these values. It has been found that nearly all the countries have increased their fares in gold francs. Could we not find some other formula ?

**Mr. Colle (in French).** — What do you suggest ?

**Dr. Wang.** — I agree with Mr. LALONI. It is important to study the question from the financial point of view. We must not overlook the difference in the

cost of living in 1913 compared with the present day.

**Mr. Mathur, Indian Government Railways, India.** — To my mind, there is no link between the increase particularly so far as India is concerned, because the wage bill in India will be many times more than in 1913 and new stock costs much more also than in 1913. Therefore, if any increase in fares is to be made you must revalue at the present cost to determine the cost per passenger mile, and on that basis revise passenger fares.

**Mr. Dargeou, French National Railways** (in French). — I agree with the Summary in the main, but I think :

1) The fares in force in 1913 should not be used as a reference. In some countries the fares were too low at that time. Moreover some Administrations have already revalued their passenger fares much higher than the 1913 level. I think it would be better to leave this reference to 1913 out.

2) We are all agreed on the necessity of achieving financial equilibrium between the passenger and goods services, to avoid the passenger services being subsidized by the goods services.

I think the following wording would meet everyone's requirements :

« The passenger fares should be revaloured to approach as near as possible to a level enabling to ensure the financial balance of passenger traffic without subsidy from the goods traffic. »

**Dr. Wang.** — I heartily support the suggestion made by Mr. DARGEOU which meets all the conditions to my mind.

**Mr. Laloni** (in French). — I also agree, though I should prefer to say « readjusted » rather than « revalorised ».

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — I agree, « readjusted » is better.

**Mr. Wansink, Netherlands Railways** (in French). — I should like to add a few remarks to those already made.

Our first duty is to establish equilibrium between the receipts and total expenses. Consequently, I do not think it wise to separate the passenger receipts and expenses from the goods. The conclusion that we must avoid a situation which means that the passenger traffic is subsidized by the goods services does not hold good in every country, as in some cases we find the passenger services subsidizing the goods services.

**The President** (in French). — I think we should try to bring these discussions to a conclusion. Various remarks have been made. It has been stated that the cost of passenger transport must be calculated; it is not easy to do so, but this is certainly true. Mr. LORRIOT suggested saying not that the fares should be increased but that they should be modified and readjusted to bring them to such a level that they would not have to be subsidized by the goods receipts. This necessitates drawing up a sort of budget for the passenger and goods receipts. It has also been stated that we should not concern ourselves with separating the passenger accounts from the goods accounts, but that the Administrations should prepare general accounts covering all the passenger and goods receipts.

Taking into account the different opinions put forward, I think that in order

to express an idea reflecting what should be the tendency, we should say that the passenger fares should be adjusted to make them follow as closely as possible the cost of the passenger services.

We cannot say that the passenger receipts should entirely cover the expenses involved in the passenger services. But I think we can state that the tendency should be to make the price of the passenger services approximate to the cost involved.

Such a tendency will I think make it possible to prepare balanced accounts, always provided that improvements in the passenger services do not involve too great expense.

I should be much obliged if Mr. DARGEON would revise the summary and suggest a text which will satisfy everyone.

**Mr. Dargeon (in French).** — I suggest the following wording :

« Passenger fares should be readjusted in order to approach as near as is judged possible a level which would enable an equilibrium of passenger traffic expenditure. »

**The President (in French).** — I think that this text meets the case.

— *The Section signified its approval.*

**Mr. Besnard, Ministry of Public Works & Transport, France (in French).** — I should like to make a purely formal observation. In Mr. LORRIOT's general summaries, paragraph 3, it is stated : « In our opinion the demands which will be made, which will be supported in many cases by the Public authorities, must be strenuously resisted... » I think it would be better to say : « in our opinion the public authorities and railways should

strenuously resist... (So as not to bring out the opposition which we all know only too well !) the demands made... »

**The President (in French).** — For the moment we are dealing with the guiding principles, after which we can consider the question of resisting the public authorities. We are, for the moment, affirming the principle that the passenger fares, at their present level, cannot cover the cost of operating these services. It is necessary for the Administrations to endeavour to increase and adjust the fares to meet the different demands and they should be brought to such a level that the passenger receipts more or less cover the cost of these services.

I think therefore that the point raised by Mr. BESNARD can be considered later on. (*Agreed.*)

We now come to the second paragraph which reads as follows :

« If passenger fares were too low the Railway Administrations, having the balancing of their budget in mind, would be forced to an excessive curtailment of their trains with the risk of depriving their clientele of *indispensable* facilities, or to increase the goods rates, which would render them particularly vulnerable to road competition. »

This is in some sort an explanation of the Summary already agreed. It seems to me a fairly accurate explanation. If we do not maintain equilibrium between the cost of the passenger services and the receipts, we are forced to reduce the number of trains to too great an extent, which implies reducing the facilities offered to the public. On the other hand, if we increase the goods rates, we open the door to road competition. These are both dangers that must be avoided.

It seems that we are all agreed upon the wording suggested and we can go on to point 2. (*Signs of assent.*)

### *Summary No. 2.*

The mileage of trains must be severely limited, whilst giving a satisfactory and rational service to the clientele.

— As no one wishes to say anything, the text of this *first paragraph* is adopted.

We now come to the *second paragraph* of point 2 :

*On main lines.* In principle « speed at all costs » should be given up, sufficient day and night services being maintained between the large towns.

I wish to point out that in this Summary, mention is made separately of main lines and secondary lines, the latter will be examined later on.

It is stated in the second paragraph that « In principle „speed at all costs” should be given up. » This is a very fitting statement as no matter how desirable a thing may be, when one is short of money one should give it up and concentrate on necessities. I think that everyone will agree that « speed at all costs » must be given up.

*The second paragraph is adopted without remark,* and the examination of the Summaries continued.

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — We might start the third paragraph by the word « however » in order to avoid an apparent contradiction with the preceding paragraph.

**The President** (in French). — The third paragraph will therefore be worded as follows :

However, on lines where a potential development of traffic exists, a few high speed

trains offering great comfort will be run in order to facilitate and encourage travel.

I think everyone will agree to this wording. (*Agreed.*)

We will now go on to the *fourth paragraph* :

Electrification of these routes appears interesting, electric traction being a means of obtaining economically a frequent and speedy service likely to promote an increase of traffic.

I do not think there is any objection to saying that electrification should be encouraged, that it has proved satisfactory and makes it possible to give fast services at a reasonable cost.

— *Adopted.*

This brings us to the two following paragraphs :

Long distance slow trains are costly on account of their poor utilisation on the greater part of the route. They can be replaced by short distance trains whose composition can be more justly appropriated to potential traffic, timings better adapted to the needs of the clientele and whose higher commercial speed will enable an easy working of the lines with fast and frequent services. The fast and slow trains will be usefully replaced on the main lines by powerful rail cars.

In order to meet the fluctuations of the traffic, these rail cars should be able to be coupled and have a reserve of power sufficient to take an extra vehicle without an excessive repercussion on the time-table.

Here there are two different statements. First of all it is stated that long distance stopping trains are costly because of their poor utilisation over the greater part of the journey, and the long distance slow trains should be replaced by short distance fast trains of suitable composition with timings better adapted to the requirements of the public.

The long distance services should be covered by through trains, leaving the services to neighbouring places to slow trains. I think this is the usual practice.

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — To make the discussion clearer, I should like to remind you that we are only considering main lines at present. If long distance slow trains are run on such lines, for journeys of 100 to 150 km. (62 to 93 miles), the train is long enough to cope with a lot of passengers at the beginning of the journey, and its size remains the same over other sections where there are not many passengers, which is a drawback. This long train ought to be cut up into several trains which will carry the passengers to the through and semi-through trains at connecting stations. In this way the composition of the trains can be adapted to their user. When a long distance train has been cut up into three or four trains in this way, railcars can obviously be used instead of these trains. We require such railcars to be so designed that they have sufficient power to haul a trailer on certain sections where there are more passengers. In this way the expense of two railcars over part of the route is avoided without altering the service, but some loosening of the time-table must be allowed.

**Mr. Ballinari, Swiss Federal Railways** (in French). — We agree that long distance slow trains are costly. In Switzerland, there are lines with mixed passenger and goods traffic. We also run slow trains with return goods. As far as the use of railcars is concerned, experience goes to show that this system is not always satisfactory. The kind of traffic between two large towns must be seen to appreciate that railcars cannot be used on every line.

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — I agree with the remark just made. We have had a long experience of railcars in France; our conclusions agree with those of Mr. LORRIOT. Railcars can be used on certain lines but not on every line. On certain lines with fast services, both the fast and slow trains can be replaced by railcars, especially if powerful railcars able to haul one or several vehicles are available.

I think the wording suggested by Mr. COLLE should be modified as follows :

« Long distance stopping trains are costly on account of their poor utilisation on the greater part of the route. They can be replaced by short distance trains whose composition can be accurately adapted to the traffic, timings better adapted to the needs of the clientele and whose higher commercial speed will enable an easy operation of the lines with fast and frequent services. Certain fast and stopping trains will be usefully replaced on the main lines by powerful railcars. »

**Mr. Giesberger, Netherlands Railways and Vice President** (in French). — In Holland, we have carried out experiments with trains at spaced timings. The earliest were as long ago as 1938, but our work was lost during the war. Since the liberation however we have gone back to the system of spaced timings, not only in the case of long distance trains but also for slow trains and trains on secondary lines. We all talk of attracting passengers to the railway. On the main lines there are trains which stop frequently and yet are not used to the desired extent. The proper composition of trains can only be determined by trial and error. At the present we have to fight against competition not only from the omnibus but also from the aeroplane.

When we can organise trains which stop like an omnibus at fixed times at easily remembered intervals, we shall have improved the service. When he wishes to travel by bus or aeroplane, the passenger knows that these leave at regular times, for example at 9 o'clock, 9.30, and 10, i.e. at regular intervals. In 1937-1938 we introduced regular services at fixed hours like this and in 1939 we found the deficit was declining. I think it is in the interests of the railway to consider the possibility of organising regular train services in the different countries. It is the only system which offers the same advantages as the aeroplane and omnibus.

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — I agree with Mr. GIESBERGER and his idea is taken up in the following point in dealing with suburban services. But we are now speaking of lines with heavy traffic over fairly long distances. On those met with on the Netherlands Railways, the services must be spaced over the day.

**Mr. Ballinari** (in French). — In the case of regular traffic we have also tried in Switzerland the system described by Mr. GIESBERGER. But such a system cannot be adopted on our lines, where there is no train traffic comparable to that between Antwerp and Brussels for example. Our trains are not the same at all hours of the day. There are 18 through trains between Lucerne and Olten, but they are not all the same size. Morning and evening, the number of passengers is higher for example than between 9 and 12 and 3 and 6. There are slack periods when the size of the trains must be reduced, while they have to be increased morning and evening.

**The President** (in French). — Everyone will agree with the observations made by Messrs. GIESBERGER et BALLINARI. This question is of interest to all Administrations. The trains must be adapted to the passenger traffic. In every country, there is more traffic morning and evening than at other hours of the day. This question forms part of the second part of our investigations; we will come to it further on.

We might accept Mr. DARGEON's suggestion and say :

« ... whose composition can be more justly appropriated to potential traffic... etc. » and for the second sentence : « Certain fast and slow trains can be (instead of *will be*) usefully replaced on the main lines by powerful railcars. »

I will read again the passage under discussion and I think everyone will agree with the suggested wording :

« Long distance slow trains are costly on account of their poor utilisation on the greater part of the route. They can be replaced by short distance trains whose composition will be more justly appropriated to potential traffic, timings better adapted to the needs of the clientele and whose higher commercial speed will enable an easy operation of the lines with fast and frequent services. Certain fast and slow trains can be usefully replaced on the main lines by powerful rail cars.

In order to meet the fluctuations of the traffic, these railcars should be able to be coupled and have a reserve of power sufficient to take an extra vehicle without an excessive repercussion on the timetables. »

(*Agreed.*)

This text is therefore adopted.

We will now consider the rest of the suggested text :

*The service on secondary lines* will be covered by a shuttle service of railcars which can be coupled and have sufficient power to haul one or two trailers.

A steam train shuttle service could eventually be provided for fast transport which could not be dealt with by the railcars.

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — Services on secondary lines where it is proposed systematically to assure the service by railcars cannot be taken as a general formula. On some secondary lines at certain hours there is a too great amount of passenger traffic. There is certainly a tendency to endeavour to assure the service by means of railcars but this cannot be stated as a general rule in the summaries. I think we should add the words «as far as possible», so that the text would read :

«*The service on secondary lines* would be covered *as far as possible* by a shuttle service of railcars which can be coupled and have sufficient power to haul one or two trailers. »

The second paragraph is concerned essentially with *fast goods traffic*. We might as well suppress this paragraph altogether.

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — We have not got to deal with goods transport generally, but only with fast goods traffic carried by passenger trains. In such cases a steam train must be run for this goods traffic if the goods wagons cannot be coupled up to the railcar. This is dealt with on page 21 of Mr. LORRIOT's report.

**The President** (in French). — If everyone agrees, we will keep the text as

it is. The second paragraph does not contradict the first, so it can be retained; it explains the matter more precisely.

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — We might say : «a shuttle service of passenger trains».

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — No, it would not necessarily be «passenger».

**The President** (in French). — We will therefore keep the text as it is.

(Agreed.)

We will go on to the next paragraphs of this Summary :

*The service on suburban lines* would be covered by sets of trains of regular frequency, each train of the set being affected to the service of determined stations or of a determined zone.

These lines would be electrified in order to develop and speed up the service with a view to increasing the traffic.

On suburban lines, the traffic to the large towns has to be covered; passengers have to make the journey morning and night, and the services on these lines will be assured by sets of trains at regular intervals...

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — There is a mistake in the French text; the word «*série*» should be replaced by «*batterie*» (set).

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — To take into account the statement made just now by Mr. GIESBERGER we might say : suburban services and services between large towns that are close to each other. For example Nice-Menton, Nice-Monaco, Brussels-Antwerp and Rotterdam-The Hague. This is not suburban traffic but short distance traffic between large centres.

We might say therefore : « The services on suburban lines and certain short services between large centres would be covered by sets of trains at regular intervals, each train of the set being affected to the service of determined stations or a determined zone. »

**The President** (in French). — I think that everyone will agree to this modification. It is a very useful one.

(*Agreed.*)

**Mr. Fischer, Swiss Executive Organising Committee** (in French). — Now that we have finished discussing Summary 2, I would like to go back a little to the beginning of this Summary. It seems to me that the wording is not quite right. I quite understand what the Reporter wants to say : he is obviously concerned with steam traction. But it seems to me too general a statement to say « the train mileage should be strictly limited, whilst giving a satisfactory and rational service to the clientele ». This may be the case in certain countries, especially in the case of steam traction, but it is not altogether accurate in the case of other methods of traction. On the contrary, we are trying to find a better way of increasing the number of services. For this reason I should like a more general wording which would take other situations into account, for example :

« The mileage of trains must be determined or fixed in an economic way, whilst giving... etc.». I think the original text will give the public a bad impression if they read our Summaries stating that the services should be limited. It would be better to find another wording.

**The President** (in French). — We must go back to the first paragraph of Summary 2 which reads : « The mileage of trains must be severely limited, whilst giving a satisfactory and rational service to the clientele.» It is suggested that we omit the word « severely » which seems to be too absolute and might give the public a wrong impression. It is suggested that the wording be so modified that it does not leave the impression that the Railways agree that the mileage of trains should be reduced to the minimum.

I am not sure if replacing « severely » by « economically » really expresses the idea we have in mind. It seems to me that the Reporter meant to state that generally speaking the Administrations are tempted to increase the train mileage and this policy should be resisted. We want to state that the tendency to limit the mileage should consist above all in not organising very long services, whilst maintaining sufficient services to meet any competition.

**Mr. Maccallini, Compagnie des Chemins de fer Danubio-Sava-Adriatico, Italy** (in French). — We might say : « The mileage should be strictly limited according to traffic requirements to prevent unnecessary expense.»

**Mr. Fischer** (in French). — I suggest saying : « should be fixed economically » instead of « limited ».

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — We want to avoid excessive train mileage. We have had experience of such inflated mileage in France between 1919 and 1938. Theoretically it was interesting from a commercial point of view, but in actual

practice it proved a poor proposition : the receipts did not increase, while the expenses incurred never stopped increasing. It is essential to resist inflation. Perhaps we might say : « ... limited to the minimum compatible with the satisfied needs of the clientele ».

**Mr. Favière, Ministry of Public Works and Transport, France** (in French). — We must endeavour to reduce the train mileage whilst giving reasonable services. The policy of heavy trains must not be carried too far.

**The President** (in French). — This suggestion is similar to Mr. DARGEOU's.

**Mr. Favière** (in French). — Instead of « endeavouring » we might say : « We should limit the train mileage... etc. »

**Mr. Fischer** (in French). — I would like to leave the word « limit » out. The services should be increased. On certain lines there are special difficulties : passengers are left standing on the platforms because there is no room for them in the trains. In such cases the service must be improved, and you are talking of limiting it. In some countries, on certain journeys the passengers are literally squashed to death.

**The President** (in French). — Suppose we said : « Should endeavour to limit ».

**A Delegate** (in French). — I suggest saying : « Avoiding useless runs. »

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — They are never useless. They cost a lot, but they are not useless.

**The President** (in French). — In the original wording it was stated : « ... must be severely limited... » which does not meet the case. The expression « ... limited to the minimum compatible... » would likewise not meet the case, as sometimes the mileage must be increased rather than limited.

It is no good making a mere statement of fact; we have to remind the Railway Administrations and the public that proper organisation of the services implies limiting the train mileage to what is really necessary. The train mileage must be fixed in close relation with requirements, whilst giving a satisfactory service. We might say :

« The mileage of trains must be fixed strictly in accordance with actual necessity, whilst giving a satisfactory and rational service to the clientele. »

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — We might say : « In order to avoid inflation of the mileage of trains, this should be fixed strictly in accordance with actual necessity. »

**Mr. Moulart, Belgian National Railways** (in French). — I suggest adding : « From the double point of view of economy and the general needs of the public. »

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — This is getting nearer the mark. In the first paragraph we have to indicate the tendency. If we do not want to say : « Limiting the mileage » we might say : « inflation of the mileage must be avoided. »

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — I suggest the following wording : « In order to avoid inflation of the mileage of trains, the latter should be fixed at a level

strictly adapted to the necessities of realizing a rational service giving satisfaction to the clientele. »

**The President** (in French). — This is an assertion which it is useful to mention in the text. The Administrations must be reminded that they must avoid inflation of the mileage and give a rational service.

**Mr. Favière** (in French). — I suggest suppressing the word « strictly ».

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — I regret that I cannot support this suggestion. It says « to avoid inflation ». At what level are we to stop then ? That is why we said

« strictly » because there are several levels. The level must be defined.

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — We might say : « Exactly adapted ».

**The President** (in French). — Here then is the wording suggested :

« In order to avoid inflation of the mileage of trains, the latter should be fixed at a level exactly adapted to the necessities of a rational service giving satisfaction to the clientele. »

If everyone agrees, I will consider this text as adopted. (*Agreed.*)

Gentlemen, in view of the time, I think we should continue these discussions tomorrow.

The meeting closed at 12.25.

## Meeting held on the 26th June 1947.

Dr. G. C. PALMIERI, ENGINEER, IN THE CHAIR.

— The meeting opened at 9.30 a.m.

**The President** (in French). — Yesterday, we considered the first two Summaries. We will now go on to discuss *Summary No. 3* :

The weight of the rolling stock should be lighter in order to reduce traction and maintenance costs. Whereas before 1940, the tendency on main lines was towards the adoption of bogie coaches of 50 tons, the building of coaches weighing more than from 30 to 35 tons should be abandoned, the same safety and comfort being guaranteed to the passengers.

In this paragraph there is an allusion to the weight of coaches before the war. The tendency then was to increase the

weight of rolling stock whereas now we propose re-examining the position and state that it is desirable to give up heavy construction. The stock should not weigh more than 30 to 35 tonnes.

The question of lightening rolling stock is being discussed by another Section of the Congress; we must therefore limit ourselves to recognising the chance to lighten the stock, while it is the job of the other section to deal with the how and wherefore.

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — Summary 3 stipulates : « The weight of the rolling stock should be lightened in order to reduce traction and maintenance costs. »

When I drew up this Summary, I wondered if this sentence went far enough. As I was lacking in experience myself, I took Mr. LORRIOT's report as a basis and added the second sentence. Perhaps other railways with greater experience might state that it would be better not to fix any limits but leave the job of determining the weight to the technical services.

For example they might stop at 20 or 25 tonnes. The second sentence could be made more precise, leaving it to the technical services to decide what degree of weight reduction is desirable in passenger stock.

**The President** (in French). — The second sentence of Summary 3 is perhaps too absolute, too precise. It might be better merely to say that the weight of the stock should be reduced as far as this is compatible with guaranteeing the same standard of safety and comfort to the passengers. It is not quite our province to fix any particular weight.

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — I remember that at their meeting yesterday, Sections 2 and 5 when discussing the question of lightening rolling stock did not wish to specify any particular weight. Mention was made of 30 tonnes, but certain railways were against this, as safety reasons made it impossible for them to get such a low figure. We want the minimum weight compatible with the safety and comfort of the passengers. We should not stipulate any weight when the other Sections did not do so. We can delete the reference to a weight of 30 to 35 tons as long as we state that the aim is the minimum weight compatible with the comfort and the safety of the passengers.

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — I agree as far as the formula is concerned, but I would like to ask the following question : we seem to imply that the weight of the rolling stock should be reduced solely to decrease traction and maintenance costs. There are other reasons for lightening the stock :

1) we will get improved performance with the same transport capacity, for a given engine power, if we lighten the train;

2) inversely, for the same engine power with the same load and same speed, the lightening of the rolling stock allow us to increase the transport capacity.

I suggest therefore that we say :

“ The rolling stock should be lightened to decrease traction and maintenance costs and to improve the possible performance or increase the transport capacity. ”

**The President** (in French). — There are two suggestions before us :

1) Mr. COLLE's that no precise mention should be made of the weight of the new coaches; and

2) Mr. DARGEOU's that the advantages of weight reduction should not be limited to decreased traction and maintenance costs, but should also result in improved performance and an increase in the capacity of the trains.

**Mr. Ranjit Singh**. — We can state in general terms the object of reducing the weight, but if we give up the idea of fixing a lower limit, it might still be useful to fix a higher limit so that Administrations can find in our Summaries fi-

gures guiding them as to the maximum possible weight of rolling stock.

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — We have left it to the technical services to determine the weight, but it is this idea of the higher limit that we should give up. I suggest therefore saying :

« The rolling stock should be lightened to decrease traction and maintenance costs and to make possible an increase in the speed and capacity of passenger trains.

Whereas in 1940 the tendency was towards 50 ton bogie coaches, it is desirable to design coaches whose weight has been reduced to the maximum compatible with the same degree of safety and comfort for the passengers. »

If this text receives everyone's approval, it will agree with the decisions taken by the Rolling Stock Weight Reduction Committee who did not wish to fix the upper limits since considerations of comfort might lead some railway to exceed the figure given.

**Mr. Maccallini** (in French). — All the members of the second Section were agreed upon the great advantages of weight reduction from the technical and economic point of view. It has been stated in the report that railcars have not given satisfactory results, but it should not be forgotten that several Administrations have recently adopted on main lines, with great success, light units consisting of rakes of a few coaches with a diesel or electric motor unit, which represents the last word from the technical point of view. These light weight units have been found most satisfactory by the public. Economically the same cannot be said for them, because speed is expensive and the

putting into service of these light weight units involves considerable expense. Should the Summary inspired by this question be interpreted as meaning adopting heavy trains made with lightened stock and abandoning light trains ? I think not but it should be said so more precisely.

**Mr. van Haersolte** (in French). — Mr. COLLE has suggested a text in which he states « with the same degree of safety and comfort ». I would prefer to say « with at least the same degree of safety and comfort ». It is very possible that up-to-date methods of construction will give us more comfort and greater security.

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — Yes, at least equal comfort and safety.

**The President** (in French). — We said yesterday that for the services on secondary lines the greatest possible use should be made of railcars which could if necessary be coupled to trailers. Is there not some contradiction between Summary 3 and what was agreed yesterday ? Perhaps we could say : « For heavy main line trains... »

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — I do not think there is the slightest contradiction, since yesterday when dealing with Summary 2 we discussed not only secondary lines but also main lines. It was stated that on the main lines certain fast and slow trains could be replaced by railcars. But in addition to heavy and light trains, there are also rakes and railcars. This is specified in Summary 2.

Summary 3 deals with the stock, but this can cover a motor unit or railcar as

well as a coach. Consequently I think the wording is quite satisfactory.

**The President** (in French). — The suggested text is : « Rolling stock should be reduced in weight to decrease traction and maintenance costs... »

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — To be more precise, we might say : « and to make possible either an increase in the speed or an increase in the capacity. »

**The President** (in French). — We are therefore agreed to say :

« The weight of the rolling stock should be lightened in order to reduce traction and maintenance costs and to render possible an increase either of the speed or of the capacity of passenger trains.

Whereas before 1940 the tendency was towards 50 ton main line bogie stock, it now appears desirable to build light weight coaches... »

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — A simple suggestion : instead of « coaches » we might say « passenger vehicles ». This would include both ordinary coaches and railcars. The railcar is also a vehicle.

**The President** (in French). — If everyone agree we will therefore replace « coaches » by « passenger vehicles ».

(*Agreed.*)

I will continue the reading of the text:

« ... to build passenger vehicles whose weight has been reduced to the maximum compatible with the same degree of safety and comfort. »

— *The Section signified its approval.*

**The President** (in French). — As everyone agrees, we will go on to *Summary No. 4* :

4. The high peaks of traffic occurring at certain holiday seasons require an important reserve of rolling stock which is unemployed the rest of the time and should be reduced to a minimum :

a) by staggering the peak periods by bringing into force tariff measures reducing or cancelling at festive holiday times the reductions granted to certain categories of passengers;

b) by limitation of the number of seats offered by making compulsory the advance booking of seats on certain trains;

c) by a more intense utilization of the rolling stock required in normal traffic;

d) by organising the maintenance and repairs in order to reduce to a minimum at critical times the immobilization of coaches in repair and maintenance shops;

e) by taking steps with the competent authorities to obtain a better staggering of holidays with pay.

I do not think that anyone will have any remarks to make about the wording of the first sentence : « the high peaks of traffic occurring at certain holiday seasons require an important reserve of rolling stock which is unemployed the rest of the time and should be reduced to a minimum ».

(*Agreed.*)

So we will go on to the following points :

To reduce rolling stock held in reserve to the minimum it is necessary to : « stagger the peak periods by bringing into force rating measures reducing or cancelling at holiday times the reductions granted to certain categories of passengers. »

**Mr. Manitto Tôrres, Benguela Railway** (in French). — I agree with points c), d) and e) of the Summary but the prac-

tical results of the proposal mentioned in the latter point are in my opinion very limited.

With regard to point *a*) and *b*), I think that they are to the point as far as large railways are concerned and for countries like France, Switzerland or Belgium where there are a lot of railway passengers, constituting a mass not liable to be seriously influenced by motor competition.

But there are other smaller railways where there are fewer passengers and where road competition is very important and represents a real danger. The summaries, in these circumstances, are in my opinion in their present form, not suitable.

To sum up, I do not doubt of the advantages of staggering for the Administrations, one may consider theoretically independent with regard to passenger traffic. As far as the other Administrations are concerned, and there are many, to refuse services, impose conditions and create difficulties, in face of an able and active competition might be harmful to the railway and its noble characteristics which have so much helped to overcome the competition and secure a victory, which must be guaranteed permanently.

I am convinced, like everyone, that to increase the running cost by neglecting the high peaks of traffic or leaving an important reserve of rolling stock unemployed the rest of the time is against the interest of a sound working and I ask therefore that the text be replaced by a more conciliatory wording taking into account the situation as it affects the small railways as well as the large.

**The President (in French).** — Whilst awaiting Mr. MANITTO TORRES' suggested

wording, I would like to know if there are any other remarks.

**Col. Slaughter, H.E.H. The Nizam's State Railways, India.** — This has already been made clear, adequate economic fares and co-ordination are the main issues. Co-ordination has in these discussions been almost entirely ignored, and I feel we should have more satisfaction in this respect.

I have had the opportunity of organising a road and rail service which has been very successful with the public over the past 10 or 12 years, under one administration, and under also one financial structure.

I am of the opinion that this is the only real answer to these problems you are debating. I consider there should be some indication that «co-ordination» has been either deliberately avoided on this important question or that it has been debated and found outside the terms of reference.

**The President (in French).** — This is in fact a very important question. However if we are to discuss the co-ordination of rail and road transport, we shall be going outside the scope of the question the Congress has given us to examine. We can make a reference to the subject if you like, but I do not think it necessary since the question as set deals exclusively with the railway problem. If you will re-read the question, you will see that it is limited to the railway problem. There is therefore no need to discuss co-ordination.

Summary 4 refers to the difficulties of operating railway services at peak periods of traffic on public holidays and for holidays with pay. I do not know if we could add the question of the co-ordina-

tion of rail and road to it; I think this would be going outside our agenda. This at any rate is my personal opinion.

Unless you disagree with me, I do not see how we could take Mr. SLAUGHTER'S suggestion into account.

**Mr. Nizam Ud Din, H.E.H. The Nizam's State Railway, India.** — The question has been proposed that by regulating holidays, particularly holidays with pay, we should avoid having all the travelling at the same periods.

To discuss the re-organisation of the two kinds of traffic would fall outside our task.

**Mr. Laloni** (in French). — I think that the discussions are going rather outside the point. The reports presented must be taken into account.

There is no Railway Administration which does not have to cope with peak periods of traffic, which is not obliged to satisfy the public. Some Administrations also have other tasks to carry out.

It is simply a general question. If the operating facilities are not used to the maximum, the costs will rise.

In Belgium, during the paid holidays period, the fares are increased instead of being reduced, whereas on other Railways on the contrary very appreciable reductions are given. To do away with peak traffics, it is necessary to increase the fares. I do not see any other way of avoiding the drawbacks of peak traffics than those suggested. If there are any, let us hear them. As far as I am concerned I think the points mentioned by Mr. COLLE should be acceptable to everyone.

**Mr. Dandridge, Cheshire Lines Committee, Great Britain.** — I would like to

ask for an interpretation of point a) in which the reduction of concession fares is referred to.

During certain periods of the day, and at the beginning and end of the holiday season, when traffic is lighter, it is suggested that a greater number of people would be induced to travel if there were cheaper fares. This may be the practice in certain countries, but in Great Britain we have not considered it desirable to interfere with the basis of fares at specified periods when the traffic is light.

**Mr. Marin, Italian State Railways, Italy** (in French). — On the Italian railways we have to-day about 30 % of our pre-war stock in good condition. Under such circumstances, I think something should be done to show that it is possible to reduce or even suppress entirely the reduced fares allowed in the case of certain categories of passenger. Besides, it is difficult to stagger holidays and spread them over longer periods. Everyone, especially the workers, takes advantage of holidays to travel. To come down to practical methods, I think it would be possible to combine points a) and b) into a single summary stating that passengers in order to enjoy cheap fares must use the special trains run for their benefit on public holidays.

This is the time when the question of very heavy utilisation of the stock arises. There is some running light. If we could spread our passengers out, it is obvious that it would be possible to avoid running light. We could also oblige the passengers to make use of the trains which are less frequented at holiday seasons. We should also be able to do away with the workmen's trains which could be used to provide additional trains at peak periods. In this way we could over-

come some of our difficulties in future seasons.

**The President** (in French). — Gentlemen, as we still have some important points to discuss, may I ask the Delegates to be as brief as possible.

May I remind you that the object of the discussions on Summary 4 is to investigate the different methods of obtaining the end in view. The summary suggested gives some of the appropriate means; these are suggestions for the guidance of the Administrations; there is no obligation for the Railways to resort to them.

May I ask the Meeting therefore to confine itself to remarks fundamental to the question, and not to make any observations alien to the subject.

**A Delegate.** — I do not think the English text is altogether correct. We should recommend cheap fares outside peak traffic periods.

**Col. Slaughter.** — I hope you will forgive me for coming back to a point that the President considers to be outside the question.

I believe it is important to study the question of co-ordination of rail/road traffic.

I should like this to be the subject of a special Committee to give a report within 6 months on the debatable question of whether this Congress Association should deal with co-ordination of rail/road traffic, and I should like to be very forceful about this. We have been ignoring the question for 10 to 15 years.

**Mr. de Vasconcellos Porto, Portuguese Colonies State Railways** (in French). —

I think that Summary 4 is acceptable as now worded. It is a question of general principle that each one is free to adopt or not, according to the conditions of operation.

I was responsible during twenty years for managing a small railway, one subjected to high competition, and if I was still in charge, I should have no hesitation in accepting this wording. The operators are entirely free to apply the principles here laid down. As far as I am concerned, I accept the suggested wording, and I think everyone will agree with me.

**Col. Slaughter.** — Mr. President, you have said that the question of co-ordination of rail/road transport is outside our agenda...

**The President** (in French). — We will go back to this point later on.

**Mr. Manitto Tôrres** (in French). — I followed the discussion with the greatest interest. I heard that there are peak traffic periods when there are a lot of passengers to carry. I agree, but because the problem is general, it happens also on smaller railways where I insist on the point — owing to competition — the problem is more critical.

This is the reason why I would like to see in certain cases the levelling of passenger traffic dealt with by measures to attract the passengers during slack periods instead of measures to cope with peak periods of traffic.

I agree in principle with the staggering in particular for the great cases, however without neglecting here, a little like Mr. SLAUGHTER, rail-road competition, and convinced that in certain cases, strong

measures help considerably the competition. I think that in such cases the policy to be adopted should be not the staggering of the peak periods always less convenient during excursion periods but the absorption during slack periods, by special measures such as reduced fares, special prices, etc., or local attractions, such as festivals, tourist meetings, sporting events, excursions, etc., the organisation of which is greatly facilitated now by the joint efforts of propaganda of the Railways, the Press, the States, the hotel trade, holiday resorts, etc.

One would achieve in this manner, by an indirect way, a little longer however, more certain results less susceptible to dangerous reactions.

But we have already heard the PRESIDENT, to whom I wish to express here my respects and high praises, saying that the suggested Summaries do not constitute obligations or points of regulation but are simple suggestions that each Administration may adapt and apply according to circumstances.

Bearing this understanding so sensible, adaptable and clever in mind, I agree to the general principle, making only reservation with regard to the methods called for by circumstances, which I care to mention in connection with the struggle against competition.

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — I think we have said all that actually had to be said, but I also believe we have lost sight of the real meaning of the text. In effect, mention is made of peak periods of traffic. These occur when there are a lot of passengers to carry. We state that these peak periods require a great deal of stock which is not used at other times, and this increases the cost. Must all peak periods of traffic requiring the purchase

of additional stock be accepted regardless?

We say: no, new stock should not be bought until we have exhausted all the means of obtaining increased use of existing stock. How is this to be done? By staggering the peak periods, and by rating measures?

If you have 100 000 passengers and can only carry 50 000 at a time, their journeys must be staggered; some must travel the day before or the day afterwards if they cannot all be carried the same day. Let us carry 25 000 the day before and 25 000 the next day, but do not oblige us, who are seeking to obtain the lowest possible cost price, to buy stock to be used only on this one day. That is what is meant by staggering.

Limiting the number of seats: if we have to carry 50 000 passengers between 8 and 9 o'clock, and cannot manage this number, we should be able to limit the number to so many between 8 and 9 o'clock and so many between 7 and 8.

We have no intention of laying down the law. We merely give examples of ways of transporting as much traffic as possible at peak periods with the rolling stock available, without buying new stock, as the latter merely increases the cost.

We are only giving advice which everyone is free to follow. Those who never have too many passengers, can let them come as they please, but those who have enough passengers for two trains when there is only one train available must be able to take steps to meet the situation. We must avoid buying stock which will only be used at these peak periods on public holidays.

**The President** (in French). — I think we must now declare this discussion clos-

ed. I think the explanation given by Mr. COLLE is as complete as can be desired.

I would remind you that these are only suggestions. There are steps that can be taken to avoid the drawbacks of peak periods of traffic. These are merely guiding principles which are not obligatory for any Administrations. Those who do not find it necessary to put them in practice, need not do so. If other railways experience difficulties on account of the number of passengers at certain periods, they can try these methods. If they know of any other methods, they are at liberty to use these as well.

I have also to reply to Col. SLAUGHTER who raised the question of co-ordination between rail and road. I must say that this question should be put to the Permanent Commission. It does not come within our province to accept new suggestions, nor are we able to nominate Committees. We can only deal with the task that has been entrusted to us.

If you wish to suggest that this new question be studied by the Congress, you are at liberty to do so and must address yourself to the Permanent Commission who will decide the matter.

I think we can now bring this discussion to an end.

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — I think that to conclude we can suggest a wording which fundamentally sums up all the essential points. We want to bring out the fact that we wish to stagger peak periods in order to reduce the cost. We want to make it clear that these are not limiting methods. It does not mean that cheap fares cannot be granted outside peak periods.

Here is the text I suggest:

« The peak periods of traffic at certain times of the year have a serious effect on the cost of the passenger services since the stock used to run the additional services remains unused for the greater part of the year. It is desirable to reduce such peaks, for example by the following methods :

« a) reducing or suppressing the cheap fares granted to certain categories of passengers at holiday periods;

« b) if needs be introducing positive rating measures to encourage people to travel outside the holiday periods;

« c) limiting the number of seats available by making it obligatory to book all seats on certain trains;

« d) a more intensive utilisation of the stock required to run the usual services ;

« e) organisation of maintenance and repair work so as to reduce to the minimum at the critical periods the number of coaches standing idle in the repair and maintenance shops;

« f) taking steps with the competent authorities to obtain a better staggering of holidays with pay. »

**The President** (in French). — I think the summary can be adopted in this form. The last point is admissible as a reminder that we can press the public authorities to stagger certain holidays.

**Mr. Dandridge**. — I would like to make a further suggestion that the amenities and amusements at holiday places be extended with a view to prolonging the holiday season, this to be followed up with appropriate advertising. The shortness of the holiday season is an acute problem in England.

In connection with point 4 of the summaries, we try to encourage extending the holiday season even if we have to subsidise this object by advertising. I do not consider this would apply to all countries, but it is a very important problem with us.

**A Delegate.** — I am of the opinion that holidays without pay also affect railway tariffs.

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — In France, we have had some experience of the efficacy of steps taken to stagger holidays, so may I be permitted to draw attention to a point in connection with staggering holidays: it is not the holidays with which we are concerned, but travelling away to holidays.

**Mr. Favière** (in French). — This year in France a circular signed by the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Public Works was sent to the heads of all firms recommending them to stagger holidays with pay.

**The President** (in French). — I think we can all reach agreement on this point. According to point f) we can press the public authorities to extend the holiday seasons.

This is a question which concerns each Railway individually. I do not know if it is really necessary to state it here.

However, at Mr. DARGEOU's request we could word point f) as follows:

“f) taking steps with the competent authorities to obtain a better staggering of dates of holiday departures (instead of «staggering holidays with pay»).”

— *The Section agreed to this.*

**The President** (in French). — We will now go on to consider *Summary No. 5*:

5. In order to organise the transport of passengers, the Administrations should proceed with the study of running costs of trains and rail cars per category, per line and according to method of traction: steam or electricity.

This is a fairly complex question. It is obviously necessary to establish the cost. The technical, rolling stock and accountancy departments, as well as the operating, should each study the most practical means of determining the costs, as far as each one of them is concerned. This is a big question which should not be embarked upon here. What we can do is affirm the usefulness of establishing the costs. If we do not know the cost of passenger transport as well as of goods transport, it is not possible to draw up an accurate and complete balance sheet which will give a complete picture of the real state of affairs.

**Mr. Dirlewanger, Swiss Federal Railways** (in French). — Here we are limiting ourselves to establishing the running costs of different kinds of trains. Mr. LORRIOT's Summary is more general. He recommends the Administrations to draw up a balance sheet for their passenger traffic: receipts and costs. No mention is made of this here, and I wonder if it is intentional. In Summary 1 a readjustment of the fares is recommended. Now if this is to be done knowledgeably, we should know the general balance sheet for the passenger services. I should like Summary 5 to be kept as it is but with the addition of a phrase concerning the passenger service balance sheet from the point of view of receipts and costs.

**The President** (in French). — Mr. DIRLEWANGER has pointed out that in Summary 5 mention is made of the running costs and nothing is said about drawing up a balance sheet for the passenger services. It is suggested that we make an addition to this summary to take Mr. LORRIOT's summary into account.

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — I agree. We did not wish a definite distinction to be made between the passenger services on the one hand and the goods services on the other. We should know that the total cost of the passenger services amounts to such and such an amount, and that of the goods services to such and such an amount. But it is also necessary to carry the problem further and discover the running costs of fast trains, slow trains, rail motor coaches and railcars, so that all the right guiding principles can be made use of. This leads to the preparation of a balance sheet for the passenger services.

**The President** (in French). — Would it not be possible to add to the summary: « This would make it possible to draw up a balance sheet for the passenger services. »

**Mr. de Brion, Portuguese Railways Company and Vice-President** (in French). — I suggest we suppress the words « steam or electric » as mention should also be made of diesel in this case; I would prefer to say just « method of traction ».

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — We should really say: « Per category, per line, and per method of traction ». This would make it possible to prepare detailed accounts for the passenger services.

**Mr. Moulart** (in French). — The determination of the running costs is a complex problem about which the Administrations should get together. Might we not say: « In order to organise passenger transport, the Administrations should *use a common basis* to ascertain the running costs... » This would make it possible to compare their statements, but to do so involves preliminary contacts.

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — It would be a very good thing to reach such a stage. But first of all we have to begin by doing the work ourselves. If any Administration asked the Permanent Commission to deal with the problem of estimating the running costs, I would see no objection to it. But we do not want to wait four years to know on what lines we should proceed. We must continue as we think best, and be ready to compare our investigations in order to discover guiding principles which can advantageously be applied by everyone.

**The President** (in French). — Your suggestion is very much to the point. It is desirable that all the Administrations investigate the running costs in the same way. But first of all, we have to decide what shall be the common basis for calculating the running costs, and this will take us a long way already. It is certainly necessary. I am therefore of the opinion that the question of investigating the ways of estimating the running costs should be subject of a new question to be included in the agenda of the next Congress. The Permanent Commission will have to decide whether such a question is advisable. Are there any other remarks ?

**Mr. Mathur.** — I consider that the question is most important, and it would be interesting to know how each Administration proceeds in the separation of the running costs of passenger and goods traffic. Instead of waiting four years until the question can be studied by the next Congress, we might suggest that we try to get some information from various Railways as to how they proceed. Then each one could take advantage of the various methods given, in order to arrive at a universal system.

**The President (in French).** — In summary 5 we must be content with making suggestions. As all our work is based on studying the running costs, we must endeavour to reduce the passenger services to the strict minimum which is essential if we are not to incur excessive costs.

Moreover, it is suggested that we state that it is advisable in order to organise passenger transport that each Administration investigate the running costs on a common basis. However it is extremely difficult to find such a common basis. Each Administration has to calculate its running costs according to the method it finds the best. They have to discover by this means the best way of organising their passenger services. Summary 5 therefore must merely suggest to the Administrations the advisability of estimating the running costs in such a way that this can form a basis for the organisation of the passenger services.

I think we might adopt the following wording which takes the remarks made into account :

« 5. In order to organise the transport of passengers, the Administrations

should proceed with the study of running costs of trains and railcars per category, per line and per method of traction.

« This would enable the establishment of a general passenger traffic balance sheet. »

(*Agreed.*)

We now come to the final point which stipulates :

It emerges from the preceding Summaries that the idea of « speed for the sake of speed » should be abandoned and that the search for traffic at all cost is a fallacy.

In order to pursue this new tendency, the Administrations will have to show great tenacity in resisting undue demands from the public and obtain support for their action by severe discipline of the public powers and official organisations.

The first sentence is a statement of fact, and follows from what has already been said, namely that we should not go in for speed for the sake of speed, which is not advisable economically.

Nor should we search for traffic at any price.

It is suggested in addition that all the Administrations will have to show great tenacity in resisting the demands of the public. We have only to do what is necessary, necessary under present conditions, to give good passenger services.

It is also suggested that it is advisable to obtain the support of severe discipline by public authorities and official organisations for the steps taken by the different Administrations.

**Mr. Dargeou (in French).** — I think it would be better to delete the word « severe ».

**Mr. Sarma, Madras & Southern Mahratta Railway, India.** — Would someone

explain to me the meaning of : « severe discipline by the public and official organisations » ?

**Mr. Favière** (in French). — I think we should delete these last two paragraphs which do not seem to add anything to the Summaries. The last paragraph has the drawback of giving the impression that the railways are taking regressive steps. It seems to be lecturing the public authorities and Mr. LORRIOT. It would be better to delete it.

**Mr. Giesberger** (in French). — Is it not somewhat humiliating for the railways to ask the public authorities and official organisations officially for protection from the competition of the omnibus and aeroplane ? In my opinion, we should only ask for protection from unfair competition. It is necessary for the railways to fight against competition by taking steps to resist it. I suggest adding the words « unfair competition » and saying : « ... and to see their actions supported by severe discipline by the public authorities and official organisations *against unfair competition.* »

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — We must answer Mr. SARMA who wants to know what is meant by the intervention of the public authorities.

In this connection, the intervention of the public authorities consists in supporting the demands addressed to them, demands which are often exaggerated and which the railways is not always able to resist.

In reply to Mr. GIESBERGER, I would state that we are not here considering competition. What we wish to avoid is having the claims put forward by anyone supported by the public authorities

or official organisations so that they must be met. We want to avoid being forced to do what we do not wish to do, what will lead to useless expense. We want to draw the attention of the public authorities to the repercussions of the claims supported by them when they are not of general interest but only of interest in individual cases. This leads us to take steps that we do not wish to take : to run trains which do not meet a self evident need.

We are not asking to be protected from competition. We are asking that no claims be supported that are not of general interest. Therefore I suggest that we say :

« To this end, the Administrations will have to show great tenacity in resisting undue demands from the public and obtain support for their action from the public powers and official organisations. »

I said « undue » because certain claims can be made again and supported, though they do not meet certain needs. We are the servants of the public and it is only abuses that we wish to do away with. To my mind « undue » is not out of place and I think we should retain this expression.

**The President** (in French). — The suggested wording reads as follows :

« To this end, the Administrations will have to show great tenacity in resisting undue demands from the public and obtain support for their action by disciplinary measures from the public authorities and official organisations. »

**Mr. Favière** (in French). — I am certain that we are quite right in resisting the demands of the public. As far as the action of the public authorities is con-

cerned, such demands are not always encouraged. In France for example this year the public authorities have limited certain trains.

**Mr. Colle** (in French). — May I be permitted to point out that the French Government was forced by circumstances to limit the trains. Though this may be exceptional in France, it is another matter in other countries. And it is advisable to encourage the public authorities to follow the policy indicated.

**The President** (in French). — There is a very special state of affairs in France.

We want to express a general wish which will cover all Administrations. I do not think it will hurt anyone if the last sentence is left as it is. If disciplinary steps have already been taken in France as regards the passenger services, so much the better. Elsewhere however there are Administrations who are finding themselves in difficulties and it is advisable that the Congress should express this wish, the necessity of having the support of the public authorities for reducing the services instead of increasing them. I am wondering if there is any inconvenience in accepting this point. To make sure we are all agreed, I will repeat the suggestion :

« To this end, the Administrations will have to show great tenacity in resisting undue demands from the public and obtain support for their action from the public powers and official organisations. »

Are we all agreed? (*Adopted.*)

This bring us to the end of our programme.

Before the Meeting ends, however, Baron VAN HAERSOLTE wishes to go back to Summary 1.

**Mr. van Haersolte** (in French). — I must apologise for going back to Summary No. 1 which was agreed at yesterday meeting.

In the second paragraph of this Summary which begins with the words : « If passenger fares were too low the Railway Administrations, having the balancing of their budgets in mind, would be forced either to an excessive curtailment of their trains with the risk of depriving their clientele... etc. » I should like to delete the words : « to an excessive curtailment of their trains with the risk of... » seeing that « reducing the number of trains » is only one way of reducing the expenses; there are others as well. If the Sections agrees, we might say :

« If passenger fares were to low the Railway Administrations, having the balancing of their budgets in mind, would be forced either to deprive their clientele of indispensable facilities or to increase the goods rates, which would render them particularly vulnerable to road competition. »

**The President** (in French). — As no objections have been made, the second paragraph of Summary No. 1 will be modified as above.

This bring us to the end of the work.

**Mr. Dargeou** (in French). — I have a suggestion to make. In Mr. LORRIOT's report there is an important section dealing with the question of through coaches, especially on night runs, and another dealing with sleeping berths.

Would it not be advisable to mention

these two points at the end of Summary 2 by saying : « It is most advisable to run through coaches especially for night journeys over the most frequented routes.

It is also advisable to develop sleeping berths to meet any competition from other methods of transport. »

**The President (in French).** — I agree. I suggest, Gentlemen, that we add at the end of the Summary 2 :

« There is a great interest in running through coaches, especially for night travel, on the more frequented lines, in order to avoid passengers having to change trains at inconvenient hours.

It is also necessary to develop sleeping berths of all kinds in order to combat the competition of other means of transport. »

(*Agreed.*)

Gentlemen, I wish to thank you for the interest you have shown throughout the discussions, which I hope will prove fruitful. I want to thank you for your collaboration in drawing up the summaries, which I hope will be ratified at the Plenary Meeting.

**Mr. Neil, London & North Eastern Railways.** — I wish to speak on behalf of all the delegates to say to Mr. PALMIERI how impressed we are with the way he has presided. Everyone knows that the work of a President is difficult. Mr. PALMIERI has shown great patience and comprehension.

On behalf of the Third Section I ask you to accept our thanks. (*Applause.*)

The Meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

## DISCUSSION AT THE PLENARY MEETING

---

Meeting held on the 27th June 1947.

---

DR. W. MEILE, PRESIDENT, IN THE CHAIR.

GENERAL SECRETARIES : MR. P. GHILAIN AND DR. G. DREYER.

ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY : MR. EYRE A. W. TURBETT.

---

Mr. Ghilain, *General Secretary* (in French). — We will now examine the Summaries for Question III adopted by the Third Section, the text of which was published in the *Daily Journal of the Session*, No. 4.

(*Mr. GHILAIN read all these Summaries in turn.*)

*Summary 1.* — Approved.

*Summary 2.*

After the text of this Summary was read, Col. SLAUGHTER made the following remark :

Col. Slaughter, *H.E.H. The Nizam's State Railway, India.* — I regret that my suggestion to discuss the question of co-ordination of rail and road transport was not included in the discussion of the Congress and mentioned in the Conclusions.

Mr. Ghilain (in French). — Col. SLAUGHTER has asked the Permanent Commission to examine this question. At its meeting yesterday, the Permanent Commission considered this suggestion and decided to include the question of co-ordination in the agenda for one of the next meetings of the Permanent Com-

mission. It will then be decided if the question is to be included on the agenda of the next enlarged meeting of the Permanent Commission.

As Col. SLAUGHTER did not insist and no other remarks were made, *Summary No. 2 was approved.*

Mr. Ghilain then read *Summary 3* :

The weight of the rolling stock should be lightened in order to reduce traction and maintenance costs, and to render possible an increase either of the speed, or of the capacity of passenger trains.

Whereas before 1940 the tendency on main lines was towards the adoption of bogie coaches of 50 tons, the building should be undertaken of passenger vehicles lightened to a maximum compatible with safety and comfort at least equal to those existing at present.

Mr. Picard, *French National Railways* (in French). — In the second paragraph it is stated : « Whereas before 1940 the tendency on main lines was towards the adoption of bogie coaches of 50 tons... » This wording does not agree with the discussions and conclusions of the Second Section; long before 1940, several European Administrations have undertaken the study and the building of lightened metal coaches (less than 40 tons). I

think it would be advisable to alter this part of the Summary.

**Mr. Palmieri, Italian State Railways and President of the 3rd Section (in French).** — I should like to recall that before the last war, there was no doubt but that the Railways were tending towards increasing the weight more and more in order to give their passengers more comfort and greater facilities. I do not know if the limit of 50 tons quoted is absolutely exact, but the statement is that there was a tendency towards the weight; we do not say that this weight had been reached. We can recognise the fact that before the last war there was a tendency to increase the weight, whereas now it is better to design light weight vehicles within the limits compatible with a degree of safety and comfort at least equal to present standards.

**Dr. Cottier, Swiss Federation Political Department (in French).** — We might say «there was a tendency in several countries» as this was not general.

**Mr. Picard (in French).** — I think that as far back as 1935 there was a tendency towards weight reduction. To say that there was a tendency towards weight reduction before 1940 is not altogether accurate. Mr. COTTIER has suggested saying only in several countries; I should adopt this proposal.

**Mr. Palmieri (in French).** — In my opinion, it would meet everyone's wishes if the text were altered as follows : «Whereas before 1940 the average weight of main line stock exceeded 40 tons...»

**Dr. Cottier (in French).** — I agree with the suggestion of the PRESIDENT OF

the Third Section, and withdraw my own suggestion.

**Mr. Palmieri (in French).** — To be still more exact we might say : «... the average weight of metal vehicles on European main line increased to over 40 tons... etc.»

**Mr. Ghilain (in French).** — I will read *Summary No. 3* with the modification suggested by Mr. PALMIERI :

« 3. The weight of the rolling stock should be lightened in order to reduce traction and maintenance costs and to render possible an increase either of the speed or of the capacity of passenger trains.

Whereas before 1940, *the average weight of metal vehicles on European main lines increased in general to over 40 tons*, the building should be undertaken of passenger vehicles lightened to a maximum compatible with safety and comfort at least equal to those existing at present. »

**The President (in French).** — Are there any remarks about this new text ?

(*Adopted.*)

**Mr. Ghilain** read *Summary No. 4.*  
— *approved without modification.*

**Mr. Ghilain** read the text of *Summary No. 5* :

In order to organise the transport of passengers the Administrations should proceed with the study of running costs of trains and rail cars per category, per line and per method of traction.

This would enable the establishment of a general passenger traffic balance sheet.

**Mr. Marin, Italian State Railways** (in French). — I should like to repeat my request that the results of investigation into running costs be communicated to the Permanent Commission who would inform the Administrations by means of articles in the *Bulletin*. In this way it would be possible to discuss the question at the next enlarged meeting of the Permanent Commission at Lisbon.

**Mr. Palmieri** (in French). — I must say that we have worded Summary 5 as just read without involving any obligations for any Administrations. Our intention has been to make suggestions and point out the way; the Administrations are invited to investigate the train running costs. We must not oblige them to do so.

As far as communicating the results of this investigation to the Secretariat of the Congress is concerned, it is for the Permanent Commission to decide. If it thinks that this question of the running costs should form the subject of a thorough study, it may decide to submit it to the Congress; it can ask for the running costs to be studied and the results obtained submitted to it.

**The President** (in French). — I think that Mr. MARIN can suggest that the question be included on the agenda of a future Session.

**Mr. Marin** (in French). — In the wording it is stated: « The Administrations should... » This sounds like an obligation.

**Mr. Palmieri** (in French). — No, it is a recommendation.

**The President** (in French). — Instead of « should » we might say: « It is re-

commended to the Administrations to... » Do we agree ?

**Mr. Ghilain** (in French). — I will re-read Summary 5 in its modified form :

« 5. In order to organise the transport of passengers, the Administrations are recommended to proceed with the study of running costs of trains and railcars per category, per line, and per method of traction.

This will enable the establishment of a general passenger traffic balance sheet. »

(*Agreed.*)

And we finish with the following text :

« It emerges from the above summaries that the idea of « speed for the sake of speed » should be abandoned and that the search for traffic at all cost is a fallacy. To this end, the Administrations will have to show great tenacity in resisting undue demands from the public and obtain support for their action from the public powers and official organisations. »

(*Adopted.*)

**The President** (in French). — The Summaries for Question III can therefore be considered as ratified, with the modifications made to certain points.

#### Summaries.

« 1. The passenger fares should be re-adjusted in order to approach, as near as is judged possible, a level which would enable an equilibrium of passenger traffic expenditure.

« If passenger fares were too low, the Railway Administrations having the balancing of their budget in mind, would be forced either to deprive their clien-

« tele of indispensable facilities or to increase the goods rates which would render them particularly vulnerable to road competition.

« 2. In order to avoid the inflation of train mileages, the latter should be fixed at a level exactly adapted to the necessities of a rational service giving satisfaction to the clientele.

« *On main lines.* In principle, « speed at all cost » should be given up, sufficient day and night services being maintained between large centres.

« However, on lines where a potential development of traffic exists, a few high speed trains offering great comfort will be operated in order to facilitate and encourage travel.

« Electrification of these routes appears interesting, electric traction being a means of obtaining economically a frequent and speedy service likely to promote an increase of traffic. »

« Long distance slow trains are costly on account of their poor utilisation on the greater part of the route. They can be replaced by short distance trains whose composition will be more justly appropriated to potential traffic, timings better adapted to the needs of the clientele and whose higher commercial speed will enable an easy operation of the lines with fast and frequent services. Certain fast and slow trains can be usefully replaced on the main lines by powerful rail cars.

« In order to meet the fluctuations of the traffic, these rail cars should be able to be coupled and have a reserve of power sufficient to take an extra vehicle without an excessive repercussion on the time-tables.

« *The service on secondary lines* will be covered by a shuttle service of rail cars which can be coupled and have sufficient power to haul one or two trailers.

« A steam train shuttle service could eventually be provided for fast transport which could not be dealt with by the rail cars.

« *The service on suburban lines* would be covered by sets of trains of regular frequency, each train of the set being affected to the service of determined stations or of a determined zone.

« These lines would be electrified in order to develop and speed up the service with a view to increasing the clientele.

« There is a great interest in running through coaches, especially for night travel, on the more frequented lines, in order to avoid passengers having to change trains at inconvenient hours.

« It is also necessary to develop sleeping berths of all kinds in order to combat the competition of other means of transport.

« 3. The weight of the rolling stock should be lightened in order to reduce traction and maintenance costs, and to render possible an increase either of the speed, or of the capacity of passenger trains.

« Whereas before 1940 the average weight of metal vehicles on European main lines increased in general to over 40-tons, the building should be undertaken of passenger vehicles lightened to a maximum compatible with safety and comfort at least equal to those existing at present.

« 4. The traffic peaks which occur at certain periods bear heavily on the

« running costs of the passenger traffic,  
« as the rolling stock required to cope  
« with additional services remains un-  
« employed during the great part of the  
« year. It is desirable to reduce them,  
« for example by the following means :

« a) the reduction or cancellation at  
« holiday times of the tariff concessions  
« granted to certain categories of pas-  
« sengers;

« b) eventually, the bringing into  
« force of positive tariff measures induc-  
« ing passengers to arrange their jour-  
« neys outside holiday periods;

« c) the limitation of the number of  
« seats offered by rendering compulsory  
« the advance booking in certain trains;

« d) by a more intensive utilisation of  
« the rolling stock required in normal  
« traffic;

« e) by organising the maintenance  
« and repairs in order to reduce to a  
« minimum at critical times the immo-  
« bilisation of coaches in repair and  
« maintenance shops;

« f) by taking steps with the compe-  
« tent authorities to obtain a better  
« staggering of dates of holiday depar-  
« tures.

« 5. In order to organise the transport  
« of passengers, the Administrations are  
« recommended to proceed with the study  
« of running costs of trains and rail cars  
« per category, per line and per method  
« of traction.

« This will enable the establishment  
« of a general passenger traffic balance  
« sheet.

« It emerges from the above Sum-  
« maries that the idea of « speed for the  
« sake of speed » should be abandoned  
« and that the search for traffic at all  
« cost is a fallacy.

« To this end, the Administrations will  
« have to show great tenacity in resist-  
« ing undue demands from the public  
« and obtain support for their action  
« from the public powers and official  
« organisations. »

#### 4th Section : GENERAL

---

### INAUGURAL MEETING

June 25th at 9.30 a.m.

---

PROVISIONAL CHAIRMAN : Mr. RAOUL DA COSTA COUVREUR,  
MEMBER OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSION OF THE ASSOCIATION.

---

— The Meeting opened at 9.30 a.m.

The President (in French). — Gentlemen, I have been asked by the Permanent Commission to set up the 4th Section and form its Bureau.

The Permanent Commission has suggested as *President*, *His Excellency H. H. LING*, Vice Minister of Communications of China. (*Applause.*)

I suggest as *Vice-Presidents* :

Dr. Sayed ABDEL WAHED BEY, Assistant General Manager of the Egyptian State Railways;

Dr. HUYBERECHTS, Assistant General Manager of the Belgian National Railways;

Mr. E. SUNDT, General Manager of the Norwegian State Railways,

and as *Principal Secretary* :

Mr. H. LENFANT, Principal Architect of the Belgian National Railways.

— *These proposals were approved unanimously.*

— *H. E. H. H. LING took the chair as President of the Meeting.*

The President. — Gentlemen, I thank the Section most sincerely for the honour of choosing me as their President.

I am sure that I can count on the collaboration of you all so that our work can be completed as expeditiously as possible seeing that we have to place the final text of our summaries before the Plenary Meeting on the 27th June. (*Very good.*)

— The Section then nominated the rest of its Bureau at the suggestion of the PRESIDENT and drew up a provisional agenda.

---

## Revision of the Rules and Regulations of the International Railway Congress Association.

**The President.** — Gentlemen, before we begin our examination of Question IV, I have to bring to the attention of the Section a suggested modification in the Rules and Regulations of the Association. According to Article 21, we have to nominate a representative from our Section to the Special Committee charged with examining a proposed alteration of the Rules and Regulations. This concerns Article 17 dealing with the amount of the annual subscriptions.

— *The suggested modifications were read. (\*)*

In the name of the Bureau, I suggest that we nominate as our representative to the Committee for revising the Rules and Regulations Dr. Sayed ABDEL WAHED BEY, Assistant General Manager of the Egyptian State Railways, Vice-President of the Section.

— Does the Meeting agree? (*Agreed.*)

— *The Meeting then proceeded to discuss Question IV.*

---

(\*) For the text of the suggested modifications to the Rules and Regulations see *Bulletin of the International Railway Congress Association*, August 1947, page 803 (Summary of the proceedings of the Lucerne Session 1947).

#### QUESTION IV.

**The interest the Railway Companies would have in building houses for their staff of all ranks, or in assisting the building of such houses.**

---

##### Preliminary documents.

Report (Belgium and Colony, Bulgaria, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France and Colonies, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Netherlands and Colonies, Poland, Portugal and Colonies, Rumania, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Turkey and Jugoslavia), by E. L. ANTONUCCI. (See *Bulletin*, March 1947, p. 277, or separate issue No. 8.)

Report (America, Great Britain, Dominions, Protectorates and Colonies, India,

China and Egypt), by A. P. J. BALL. (See *Bulletin*, December 1946, p. 437, or separate issue No. 1.)

Supplement to report by E. L. ANTONUCCI. (See *Bulletin*, May 1947, p. 529.)

Supplement to report by A. P. J. BALL. (See *Bulletin*, March 1947, p. 353.)

*Special reporter* : Mr. F. PINTO TEIXEIRA. (See *Bulletin*, April 1947, p. 506.)

---

#### DISCUSSION BY THE SECTION.

##### Meeting held on the 25th June 1947.

HIS EXCELLENCY H. H. LING IN THE CHAIR.

---

**The President.** — We will now begin discussing Question IV :

« The interest the Railway Administrations would have in building houses for their staff of all ranks, or in assisting the building of such houses. »

I call upon the Special Reporter.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira, Special Reporter** (in French). — Gentlemen, I take it that you have all studied the reports on the question presented by Messrs. ANTONUCCI and BALL.

Consequently, I will merely read the Summaries which I drew up after examining all the information submitted to me.

Here is *Summary No. 1* :

1. The question of housing railway staff is a social problem of primary importance from the national point of view, as well as a railway working problem.

The solutions adopted in each country by the different Railway Administrations, or in course of being adopted, vary from country to country and railway to railway, according to the social and economic conditions of each

country and according to the material, labour and capital available to each Administration.

**The President.** — Gentlemen, you have heard the Special Reporter read General Summary No. 4. Does anyone wish to say anything ?

**Mr. Comber, London Midland & Scottish Railway.** — I wonder if it would not be a convenient arrangement to discuss the Summaries in general terms first of all and then refer to the individual items afterwards, as it is difficult to focus attention on what is part of a general summary.

**The President.** — Does anyone wish to say anything about this method of proceeding ?

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira (in French).** — I quite understand the wish expressed by Mr. COMBER to have a general discussion on the principles involved. These principles however are defined in Summaries Nos. 1 and 2. In my opinion it is above all a social matter. The building of houses for the railway staff has a social character over and above the question of service interests.

Consequently, before we study questions of detail we must lay down the guiding principles. I do not think however that any change in the order of the summaries is necessary.

**The President.** — Gentlemen, you have heard the opinion of the Special Reporter. He would like a general discussion on the principles involved before we go into details.

To meet his wishes, if the Section agrees, we could discuss Summaries Nos. 1 and 2 together.

Do you agree ? (*Agreed.*)

Consequently, I would ask the Special Reporter to read *Summary No. 2*.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira (in French).** — I thank the President and members of the Section for agreeing to my suggestion.

Here is the text of *Summary No. 2* :

2. All the Administrations agree that it is most desirable to have employees housed comfortably and with certainty of tenure from the point of view of the efficiency, regularity and flexibility of the service, but they do not all consider it an advantage for all members of the staff to be housed by the railway.

This is only considered essential on certain colonial railways and three other railways, while in the United States of America as a rule no accommodation is provided for any employee.

**The President.** — Has anyone any remarks to make ?

**Mr. Flament, French National Railways (in French).** — Mr. President, without disputing in any way the subject matter of Summaries 1 and 2 which the Special Reporter has just read us, I would like to ask if it would not be desirable to make the wording somewhat clearer in order to avoid the contradiction there seems to be in the first paragraph of Summary No. 2.

The Special Reporter states in effect : « ... but they do not consider it an advantage for all members of the staff to be housed by the Railway ».

As previously it is stated that the fact that a railway employee is housed by the Railway is a great advantage, the repetition of the word « advantage » in this latter sentence has not quite the meaning the Special Reporter intended to give it.

I think the idea the Special Reporter had in mind has been mistranslated, the word « advantage » should be replaced by some other word, « obligation », « necessity » or « prerogative » for example.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — Mr. President, I think Mr. FLAMENT is right.

I agree that there has been a mistranslation in the case of the word « advantage » and as far as I am concerned would prefer the word « obligation » suggested by Mr. FLAMENT.

**Dr. Huyberechts, Belgian National Railways and Vice-President** (in French). — Mr. President, I see that mention is made of the United States of America in Summary 2.

I do not think it advisable to mention the name of a railway company or administration in a text of this kind, especially as we do not know whether the United States are not interested in housing their staff or have valid reasons for not providing houses.

I think therefore it would be better to state : « ... while on one railway as a rule no accommodation is provided for any employee » without mentioning any names.

**The President.** — Are there any other remarks ?

**Mr. Endicott, Southern Railway, Great Britain.** — Our French colleague Mr. FLAMENT has proposed to replace the word « advantage » by « obligation ».

I suggest the word should be « necessary ».

**The President.** — Does anyone disagree with this ?

— Agreed.

Will the Special Reporter now reply to the remarks made by Dr. HUYBERECHTS.

**Dr. Huyberechts (in French).** — I would like to know what the Special Reporter thinks about my suggestion.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — An examination of Mr. BALL's report shows that conditions are different in the United States, as mentioned in the summaries, as social and financial conditions differ in this country from those in most other countries.

In the United States the social and financial position of railway employees differ from those in other countries and they may be said to be somewhat privileged. The Railway Administrations in consequence do not consider it necessary to house their staff.

In other countries conditions are different however, which was why we included this reference to the United States.

Consequently, I think it would lead to misunderstandings if we suppressed this reference. If the wording were amended in this way it might be read as meaning that the position is the same in all other countries, which was not the opinion I formed after reading the reports submitted to me.

I would like to add that I am not making it a personal matter, but I repeat that I am afraid of giving rise to misunderstandings which would be a pity.

I am moreover persuaded that the United States will not object to being mentioned in the text.

**Dr. Huyberechts (in French).** — I would like to remark that the Summaries are conceived on general lines and are also intended for those who have not studied all the reports.

I would like to stress the fact that this is the only time the name of a country has been given in the Summaries. Like the Special Reporter I do not think that the United States would object to seeing their country mentioned in the summaries as not providing houses for their staff, but I suppose that in any case the American Railway Administrations would prefer it to be stated why this is so, and this, Gentlemen, is not made clear in the Summaries.

As Mr. PINTO TEIXEIRA says, those who have not read all the reports might think that the United States do not house their staff because they are lacking in social spirit. And this is not the case; if such a policy is followed in the United States it is solely because the standard of living and social standing of the staff make it unnecessary.

To avoid misunderstandings therefore, if we decide to mention the United States in the text of the Summaries, I want the reasons why America does this to be stated as well, for example by adding : «as the social situation of the latter is sufficiently good».

I would like to know what the Special Reporter thinks of my suggestion.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — I agree with Dr. HUYBERECHTS' suggestion.

**The President.** — Can you suggest a definite wording from this exchange of ideas ?

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — We might perhaps alter the wording as follows : «... while in the United States of America as a rule no accommodation is provided for employees, *as the social situation of the latter makes it unnecessary.*»

**Mr. Barnes, London & North Eastern Railway.** — I would like to make another suggestion; it occurs to me that as an alternative the second paragraph of Summary 2 might be omitted altogether; the whole substance of Summary 2 is in the first paragraph and it would solve the rather complicated question of the social situation in the United States.

**Mr. Comber.** — I believe that if a full stop were put at the end of the word «railways» in the third line of the last paragraph, this would meet the case. It would avoid cutting out so much more of the sense than if you left out the whole paragraph, but it would throw into relief the fact that it was only considered essential on certain Colonial and three other Railways. This seems to be the vital point.

**Mr. Barnes.** — In these circumstances I wish to withdraw my proposal and support the suggestion of Mr. COMBER.

**The President.** — What does the Special Reporter say ?

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — Gentlemen, I think that if we omit the text of the second paragraph from «other railways» to the end, this Summary will no longer be a true expression of the Reports.

In fact the reasons why certain Colonial railways and three other railways house their staff differ completely from the reasons why the railways of the United States of America do not house their staff.

Consequently, if we omit this part of the Summary, it will no longer sum-up what was reported by the different countries.

The impression given is that this is general on all railways, a misunderstanding to be avoided. I included this reference in the text simply to make the Summary clearer. In my opinion it would be better to keep the text as it is.

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — We might get round the difficulty by saying after the words « three other railways » « all the Railways except those in the United States of America where the social situation of the staff makes consideration of this problem unnecessary, are agreed that... »

In fact I wish to draw the attention of the Section to the fact that if we do not mention the United States, we can no longer say « All the Administrations » in the text.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — I would like to point out, Gentlemen, that in fact at the beginning of Summary 2 we state « *All* the Administrations agree... »

In the following paragraph however we state that for certain Administrations this is a « necessity » or even « obligatory ». Then further on still we recognise that in certain countries, it is not necessary to provide houses owing to actual living conditions.

We have therefore tried to show the different situations that occur in this field.

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — I agree with the Special Reporter's remarks. It is quite true that there is a diversity of conditions.

**The President.** — Has anyone anything to say about the amendment suggested

by Dr. HUYBERECHTS, to add the following : « since social conditions in this country make it unnecessary » ?

**Mr. Barnes.** — I would like to know if it is the social conditions of the country or the social conditions of railwaymen which are referred to ?

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — To my mind obviously it is the social conditions of railwaymen. This is only logical; though it would be difficult to visualise a country in which living conditions were bad, but railway employees were living under very good conditions.

However, this remark is to the point as there might be a country in which living conditions in general were good but living conditions for railwaymen were bad.

I think we should say : « the social conditions of the staff do not justify... etc. »

**The President.** — Gentlemen, here then is the wording you are asked to agree :

« All the Administrations agree that it is most desirable to have employees housed comfortably and with certainty of tenure, from the point of view of the efficiency, regularity and flexibility of the service, but they do not consider it a necessity for all members of the staff to be housed by the Railway.

This is only considered necessary on certain Colonial Railways and three other railways, while in the United States of America as a rule no accommodation is provided for any employee, as the condition of the latter does not warrant it. »

Does anyone else wish to say anything?

**Mr. Barnes.** — I ask that when this is put to the vote the Section be allowed

the opportunity of voting on the alteration suggested by Mr. COMBER, to cut the text after the words : « three other railways ».

**The President.** — Gentlemen, I suggest that first of all we agree *Summary 1*.

I find that in fact as regards this summary this is no conflict of opinions as no alterations have been suggested.

I am therefore putting *Summary No. 1* to the vote.

— *Adopted unaltered.*

**The President.** — I will now put the *first paragraph* of *Summary No. 2* to the vote.

The text will be worded as follows :

« 2. All the Administrations agree that it is most desirable to have employees housed comfortably and with certainty of tenure from the point of view of the efficiency, regularity and flexibility of the service, but they do not all consider it necessary for all members of the staff to be housed by the Railway.

— *Adopted.*

**The President.** — As regards the *second paragraph*, there are two proposals before the Section.

The first, from Dr. HUYBERECHTS, is to add after the words « any employee » the sentence : « as conditions make this unnecessary ».

Then there is the suggestion put forward by Mr. COMBER which is to omit the sentence beginning with the words « while in the United States of America... » so that the second paragraph of the summary would stop after the words « and three other railways ».

Does the Section agree that Mr. COMBER's suggestion should be put to the vote ? (*Agreed.*)

I therefore put this amendment to the vote.

— Mr. COMBER's suggestion is put to the vote and receives 18 votes.

**The President.** — I will now put to the vote the amendment suggested by Dr. HUYBERECHTS.

— Dr. HUYBERECHTS' suggestion receives 13 votes.

**The President.** — Mr. COMBER's suggestion is therefore adopted and the final wording of the second paragraph becomes :

« This is only considered essential on certain Colonial Railways and three other railways. »

**The President.** — We will now discuss *Summary No. 3*.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — *Summary 3* :

3. In carrying out the principles laid down in the foregoing conclusions, the Railway Administrations have to supply accommodation, when there are no reasons for not doing so, to employees whose permanent presence where they work is essential in the interests of the service, and to those whose presence where they work although not essential is none the less convenient.

**The President.** — Any remarks ?

**Mr. Antonucci, Reporter** (in French). — I suggest omitting the words « when there are no reasons for not doing so ».

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — The wording of *Summary 3* seems to me to be too peremptory. I think it would be

better to say : « ... the Railway Administrations *should endeavour to supply* accommodation. »

I am also in favour of Mr. ANTONUCCI's suggestion. We might very well omit the words « when there are no reasons for not doing so ».

Finally further on I should prefer to say « ... whose presence near where they work » rather than « whose presence where they work ».

**Mr. Endicott.** — I gather it is sought to set out that those Administrations which do provide housing generally provide it only for the reasons stated and that housing is necessary at a particular point for a particular job for a particular class of employee. That is the basic principle generally. Is this not so ?

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — I would like to ask Mr. ANTONUCCI to state the reasons why he wishes to suppress the words « when there are no reasons for not doing so ».

As regards the amendment suggested by Dr. HUYBERECHTS I agree to the wording « the Railway Administrations should endeavour... ». It is in fact less imperative.

As for the amendment suggested by Mr. ENDICOTT, I am not altogether in favour of it. The reports and information received show that some of the Administrations endeavour to provide accommodation near the place of work when this is absolutely necessary. But on the other hand, there are cases in which the Administrations do not consider it absolutely necessary to provide accommodation, though it is *desirable* for service reasons to have employees living in a given place.

In such cases, when the accommodation is provided by the Administration, no rent is charged as a rule. In other cases, when it is not considered absolutely necessary to provide accommodation near the place of work, though desirable from the service point of view, a small rent is usually charged.

I could give you concrete examples of this.

This is the reason why after studying the reports submitted to me, I mentioned in the Summaries the two classes of employees housed by the Administrations.

I would therefore like Mr. ANTONUCCI to tell me why he wants to suppress the words « when there are no reasons for not doing so ».

**The President.** — Mr. COMBER wants to say something.

**Mr. Comber.** — I find myself in some difficulty as regards the words Mr. ANTONUCCI suggested should be deleted, i.e. « ... when there are no reasons for not doing so... » and I wonder if, in the third line, instead of using the words « have to » the words « *in some instances* » could not be substituted and then we could delete the words « ... when there are no reasons for not doing so... »

**Mr. Nolet de Brauwere, Belgian National Railways** (in French). — I should like to know if you are expressing a wish by this or referring to what is done in certain countries.

In fact if we say « supply » we are reporting a concrete fact. If we want to express a wish, we must say « should endeavour to supply ».

**Mr. Bertrand, French National Railways** (in French). — I was going to

make just such a remark as our Belgian colleague.

I would like to suggest that our summaries should be constructive and at least point out tendencies.

I suggest therefore, like the last speaker, we should say « should endeavour » but I want the phrase « should endeavour to supply » to be retained.

To meet everyone's wishes perhaps we should say « procure » instead of « supply ».

This amendment would leave the field clear for the different solutions mentioned in later paragraphs. Moreover « supply » is not quite the exact word; the Administration does not build the houses, it merely makes them available to the staff. « Procure » signifies both building houses and making use of existing houses.

My suggestion therefore can be summed up as modifying the text as follows : « ... should endeavour to procure accommodation... »

If my amendment is adopted, I see no reason for retaining the words « when there are no reasons for not doing so ».

**The President.** — What does the Special Reporter say ?

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — It seems to me that the amendment suggested by Mr. COMBER is a purely formal one which has no influence on the meaning of the summary.

I agree that we should replace the expression « supply » by « the Administrations *should endeavour to procure...* »

In fact this expresses the idea I had in mind more exactly, so that I am quite agreeable to it.

But this is not so when it comes to

omitting the words « when there are no reasons for not doing so ».

I found from the replies received that certain Administrations who consider it « necessary » for their employees to live near their work, do not however house such employees.

Moreover one Administration only considered it necessary for ten superintendents to live near their place of work.

It was this restriction which made me say in the text : « when there are no reasons for not doing so ».

Consequently, I think if we omit this phrase from the text of the Summaries, it might be thought that this was an absolute statement and that all Administrations house their staff — or at least those employees whom they consider must live near their place of work.

I see no objection to making the summary less imperative, but I think we should retain the phrase « when there are no reasons for not doing so ».

**Mr. Barnes.** — I wonder if the words « when there are no reasons for not doing so » are not rather subject to question. Might it not be better to alter this to read : « ... where adequate housing accommodation is not available... » I think that is really the qualification it is desired to make. All Administrations, I believe, would agree the necessity of providing housing for that section of staff who must work at a particular place, i.e. staff who are in charge of crossings, stationmasters, etc. It seems to me that the paragraph would be generally acceptable if it were amended according to my proposal.

**Col. Emerson, Railway Board, India.** — I would like to support the suggestion of Mr. BARNES.

I think it most necessary to have in this summary some reference to it not being necessary at all times to supply accommodation for those who have to live near their work. If some reference to such a condition were not put in, it might well be that the Railway Administrations would be put to unnecessary expense.

**Mr. Antonucci** (in French). — I suggest we say : « the Railway Administrations *have every interest in supplying...* »

**Mr. Barnes.** — I support Mr. ANTONUCCI's amendment.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — I would like to draw your attention to the fact that if the Section adopts Mr. ANTONUCCI's suggestion, Summary No. 3 would only express the opinion of certain members of the Railway Congress Association.

Mr. ANTONUCCI suggests saying that the Railway Administrations have every interest in housing their staff. Now, I can assure you that it appears from the information given in the reports that all the Administrations are not agreed upon this point.

I do not think that the Section should pass a Summary which merely expresses the opinion of certain Administrations. That was why I drew up the text as submitted to you.

I think moreover that some of the Delegates here present would not agree to the statement that the Administrations should provide accommodation for all their staff. Such a decision should be left to each Administration.

As for the suggested alteration : « should endeavour to procure... » I agree to this.

**Mr. Endicott.** — I wish to point out that some of the Administrations do not want to commit themselves and I would like to suggest an alteration which I think would meet the views of most present. I suggest the clause be re-drafted as under :

« In carrying out the principles laid down in the foregoing summaries, the Railway Administrations, where they supply accommodation, generally do so for employees whose permanent presence where they work is essential in the interest of the service and for those whose presence where they work although not essential is none the less convenient. »

**Mr. Bertrand** (in French). — Gentlemen, I do not quite agree with Mr. ENDICOTT.

I think it is essential that the summaries we agree should report actual tendencies. That which is suggested is simply a statement of fact.

As far as I am concerned, I find the expression « where there are no reasons for not doing so » used by the Special Reporter a valuable safety valve for any misgivings which certain delegates might feel.

« Where there are no reasons for not doing so » makes it clear that certain Administrations, for reasons of their own, do not consider it desirable to build houses for their staff. Such Administrations no doubt have their reasons.

The expression « where there are no reasons for not doing so » covers such cases.

Another colleague said just now that when accommodation was provided, there was no need for repeating the fact in the resolutions, nor for saying that the Administrations should provide it. This is another reason.

To sum up, I think that the phrase « where there is no reasons for not doing so » covers any objections that may be raised to this paragraph of Summary No. 3.

**Mr. Comber.** — May I read the whole paragraph as I see it, which I think gets over the awkward words right in the middle of the sentence :

« In carrying out the principles laid down in the foregoing summaries, the Railway Administrations who consider it necessary to house their employees should endeavour to place accommodation at the disposal of employees whose permanent presence where they work is essential in the interest of the service and of those whose presence where they work although not essential is none the less desirable. »

**Mr. Bertrand (in French).** — Gentlemen, you must forgive me for returning to the charge. We must find a formula which pleases everyone. As far as I am concerned I agree that we should say : « ... who think it necessary ». I think it would be better to say however : « who are obliged ». Such a text is much more imperative for those Administrations concerned; in effect certain Administrations who consider it necessary to build houses may not be obliged to do so.

To make matters clear, to avoid anything equivocal, we should say : « the Administrations who are obliged... »

**Mr. Flament (in French).** — Gentlemen, to the objection raised by our colleague Mr. BERTRAND to Mr. COMBER's suggestion, I should like to add another.

In effect to word the Summary as Mr. COMBER suggests seems to put on one side those Administrations who are able to

build houses for their staff, and to some extent employees who do not need to live near their place of work are excluded.

Now the object of the summary now under discussion is precisely to visualise the general problem as a whole. Account must therefore be taken of those employees who must live near their work, but we must not overlook those who are not absolutely obliged to live near their work.

The latter are not covered by « are obliged ».

**Dr. Huyberechts (in French).** — I agree to the suggestion made by our colleague Mr. BERTRAND.

I am wondering if the wording could not be slightly altered, by saying that the Administrations who are obliged or « who *desire* » to provide accommodation for their employees, etc... »

Worded like this the text leaves the Administrations concerned free to give priority to those members of their staff who must live near their work.

**Mr. Comber.** — If Dr. HUYBERECHTS' suggestion is adopted, the text would read as follows :

« In carrying out the principles laid down in the foregoing summaries, the Railway Administrations who are obliged to, or who are desirous of doing so, should endeavour to provide accommodation to employees whose permanent presence... »

**Dr. Huyberechts (in French).** — Excuse me but I must correct the interpretation of our colleague Mr. COMBER a little. I think we should say : « it is desirable that... »

On the other hand it seems to me that the expression « near their work » should be replaced by « at their work ».

**The President.** — The text would therefore read as follows :

« In carrying out the principles laid down in the foregoing summaries, the Railway Administrations who are obliged to, or who wish to procure accommodation for employees whose permanent presence at their place of work is considered necessary in the interest of the service, should endeavour to do so by giving the necessary priority to the employees in question. »

I think that worded like this, the summary takes into account the different suggestions that have been made.

What does Dr. HUYBERECHTS say ?

**Dr. Huyberechts (in French).** — As I see it the text suggested by Mr. COMBER differs essentially from that which we were considering. I think however we can easily settle the matter.

We mean to imply that the Administrations who have to or wish to house their staff do so as a rule without making any distinctions.

**Mr. COMBER** on the other hand simply states that the Administrations who wish to house employees whose permanent presence at their place of work is essential give such employees priority. He is consequently limiting the matter while we do not wish to limit it. We simply want Administrations who supply accommodation to give priority to this class of employee.

We do not wish to exclude any class of employee.

**Mr. Comber.** — I was simply trying to make Summary No. 3 clearer and acceptable to everyone.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira (in French).** — Gentlemen, this discussion does not seem to be leading anywhere. The amendments and suggestions put forward are in my opinion purely formal. The words differ, but the underlying ideas are the same, except perhaps as far as Dr. HUYBERECHTS is concerned.

I pointed out that many Administrations do not wish to house all their employees. I also stressed the fact that certain Administrations give housing priority to a given class of employee.

I think that each Administration is free to decide for itself which classes of employees it will house.

Consequently, I think it is superfluous to continue these discussions. Since the underlying principles are the same, there is in practice very little difference between Mr. COMBER's suggestion and my own summary.

**The President.** — Gentlemen, it seems to me that the time has come to put the suggested amendments to the vote. Taking into account the various suggestions made, the final wording of Summary No. 3 will read as follows :

« In carrying out the principles laid down in the foregoing summaries, the Railway Administrations should endeavour to place accommodation, when there are no reasons for not doing so, at the disposal of employees whose permanent presence where they work is essential in the interest of the service, and to those whose presence where they work although not essential is none the less desirable. »

I think we could agree about the text I have just read you.

**Mr. Barnes.** — I would like to know if the other texts will also be put to the vote.

I wish to point out that Mr. COMBER's proposal seemed agreeable to everyone. Therefore I suggest that a vote should also be taken on this text.

**The President.** — I suggest that the Section should first of all vote on the text I have just read, after which we can take a vote on the text suggested by Mr. COMBER.

I will now put the first text to the vote.

*— There were 13 votes in favour of this text.*

**The President.** — I will now ask you to vote on the text suggested by Mr. COMBER which reads as follows :

« In carrying out the principles laid down in the foregoing summaries, the

Railway Administrations who are obliged to, or who are desirous of doing so, should endeavour to place accommodation at the disposal of employees whose permanent presence where they work is essential in the interest of the service and to those whose presence where they work although not essential is none the less convenient. »

*— There were 9 votes in favour of this text.*

**The President.** — The voting is in favour of the first text which is therefore adopted. In view of the time, Gentlemen, I suggest breaking off the discussions and continuing our examination of the Summaries to-morrow morning.

*(Agreed.)*

I must remind you that we must finish our examination of the summaries to-morrow as the text must be submitted to the Plenary Meeting on June 27th.

— The Meeting adjourned at 12.15.

## Meeting held on the 26th June 1947.

HIS EXCELLENCY H. H. LING IN THE CHAIR.

— The Meeting began at 9.30.

**The President.** — Gentlemen, may I remind you that we must finish our examination of the Summaries still to be discussed to-day.

At yesterday's meeting, we got as far as Summary No. 3. As there are still six summaries to be discussed, I must ask those who intend to take part in the discussions to be as concise as possible.

The Special Reporter will now read you Summary No. 4.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — Gentlemen, Summary No. 4 reads as follows :

4. In order to provide railway staff with greater comfort and easier living conditions, it is desirable that the Administrations as well as the Governments or both together, help them to buy their own homes by means

of a system of financing building societies and staff co-operatives, by direct or indirect loans to employees, at the lowest possible rate of interest, repayable over long periods, with exemptions or reductions in rates and taxes; by supplying building sites free or at low cost by requisitioning or long term leases, together with transport facilities, supplying materials, and technical supervision of the work.

Gentlemen, when I drew up this Summary, I had not yet received the supplementary reports from the two reporters.

However, after reading these supplementary reports, I do not think there is any need to make any important modifications in the above text.

**The President.** — I call on Mr. ENDICOTT.

**Mr. Endicott.** — So far as I am concerned I would like to delete the rest of the text of this Summary after the word « periods » for the following reasons.

The exemption or reduction in rates and taxes so far as English occupiers are concerned is not possible. Under the laws of England it is not possible for any member of the population to be exempt from these and it is useless therefore to make a recommendation that is so impossible.

With regard to the question of finding sites, so far as we are concerned the finding of the house and site is left to the employee. This can be seen from the Reports. It is the employee's responsibility to get his own architect and valuation. We merely value on behalf of the Company as to the figure which should be advanced to the employee to enable him to buy a house.

With regard to the question of transport facilities, that again is impossible, because we should be giving special advantages to a small section of our em-

ployees. I believe that railway people do get special privileges for sending on their own account goods over the railway system, such as rebates. Every Railwayman gets that whether he sends bricks for his house or firewood.

Technical supervision, if really necessary, may be considered, this concerns in particular each Administration.

**The President.** — I call upon the Special Reporter.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — I have listened very carefully to Mr. ENDICOTT. I would understand his scruples if the wording was in any way imperative. But it is not. We merely state « it is desirable ». And the means which are indicated for assisting the employees concerned differ from country to country. Each Administration and each country can choose its methods.

I think if we end the Summary after the words « long periods » it would lose much of its value. It may be that definite solutions have been adopted in certain countries, whilst in other countries different solutions may be considered. In this way each can profit from the experience of the others.

Consequently, I think that as the wording of the text is not imperative, there is no drawback to keeping the enumeration of the methods mentioned in the Reports by Messrs. ANTONUCCI and BALL.

In order not to weaken the text to be agreed, I suggest the following amendment. After the words « building societies and staff co-operatives » add the words « by one of the following methods » and then go on to enumerate the methods already mentioned in the text.

I hope this suggestion will make the text agreeable to you all.

**Mr. Barnes.** — I have followed the amendment suggested which I think is an improvement, but I still feel that we should not, even in this way, suggest an exemption or reduction in rates and taxes. I do not see that there could be any justification for giving a privilege of this kind to any one section of the people. I would therefore strongly urge that at least the reference to the exemption of rates and taxes be deleted. If this amendment were agreed, I feel less objection to the remainder of the paragraph, i.e. the part dealing with building sites.

**The President.** — I call on Dr. HUYBERECHTS.

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — As our British colleague confirms, obviously no exemption from rates and taxes can be considered. I think I can assure you that the objections formulated by our British colleagues are echoed in other countries. In this field, there are the same difficulties everywhere.

Under these conditions, I suggest the following amendment : « ... as well as the Governments or both together in conformity with existing legislation... » the rest of the text being retained as it is.

I think that if we specify in the text that such methods should be « in conformity with existing legislation », there will be no trouble in any country.

**Mr. Antonucci** (in French). — After having listened with attention to the remarks made and the opinion expressed by the Special Reporter, I think the paragraph should be completed in the following way :

Adding after « ... or both together » the words « encouraging the formation of

special societies to build houses to be let to the staff and helping them to buy their own homes... » Then deleting the words « by direct or indirect loans to employees » and continuing with « at the lowest possible rate of interest ».

**Mr. Comber.** — Once again I propose to bridge the gap between different countries by adding after the words « ... long periods » « with possibly, in the case of certain countries, exemption or reduction... »

**Mr. Verbeemen, Belgian National Railways** (in French). — As regards the suggestion made just now by Mr. ANTONUCCI, I would like to point out that in the text there is no question of anything but renting houses whereas in his suggestion buying houses is also considered.

In any case I prefer the text suggested by our colleague Dr. HUYBERECHTS.

**Mr. Endicott.** — I would like to suggest that the text as drafted be accepted up to the word « periods »; then delete the rest and say « in those countries where it would be possible within the framework of existing legislation or custom to so arrange further concessions by way of exemption from rates and taxes or some of these advantages are recommended. »

**A Delegate (India).** — I support the amendment of the British delegate. The railways of India are owned and run by the State and they already sow discontent because the railway employees enjoy privileges which are not enjoyed by others of the community.

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — I also am in agreement with our British

colleague. We both have the same conception of the principle involved.

**Mr. Bertrand** (in French). — I would like to make two remarks. At the beginning of Summary No. 4, it is stated « In order to provide railway staff with greater comfort and easier living conditions... »

In my opinion the uninitiated must not be led to believe that we are asking anything out of the way by this « greater comfort » and « easier living conditions ».

It might be better to be forearmed against any objections that might be raised against this Summary by saying : « In order to ensure adequate standards of comfort and living conditions, which are so often insufficient, it is desirable... »

I think moreover that the additions which have been suggested concerning not only renting but also selling house property to railway employees are interesting.

**Mr. Kahra, Finnish Government & State Railways** (in French). — I am in support of the suggestion made by the Special Reporter who suggested adding the words « by one of the following means », which I think is a good alteration.

Moreover, I also would like the reference to exemption from rates and taxes to be deleted. It would be difficult for the Finnish Government for example to make a distinction between different classes of the State employees. If one class is given such a privilege, naturally other classes, for example customs men, or post office and telephone employees, would also want similar privileges in turn. It is essential that all State employees should be treated alike without distinction.

**The President.** — What does the Special Reporter say ?

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — Gentlemen, I have no intention of prolonging these discussions. It seems to me that the remarks made by Messrs. BERTRAND and ENDICOTT are very much to the point.

I think moreover that the suggestion put forward by Mr. ENDICOTT will meet everyone's requirements.

I would moreover remind you that it is not our object to vote a summary which would bind any country. On the other hand, it seems to be useless to introduce in our summaries statements which can be applied to given countries and disputed in others.

For this reason, I think it best to enumerate possible means as an example of what can be done, which will enable each country to decide which is the best method and each Administration to choose the method that suits it best.

**The President.** — Gentlemen, we will now vote on this point. I will first of all ask you to vote on the amendments suggested. Then I will ask you to vote on the Summary as a whole.

First of all here is the wording suggested by Mr. BERTRAND :

« In order to ensure adequate standards of comfort and living conditions to railway employees it is desirable... »

And here is Mr. ENDICOTT's amendment : put a full stop after the words « long periods ». Then continue with a new sentence worded as follows : « In those countries where it would be possible within the framework of existing legislation or custom to so arrange further concessions by way... etc. »

**Mr. Nolet de Brauwere** (in French). — Gentlemen, I think — if I may be allowed to say so before the voting takes place — that we should try not to upset the text suggested by the Special Reporter.

This text is very clear and very complete.

The only suggestion to which I can agree is that of **Mr. BERTRAND**. Like him I am of the opinion that for psychological reasons we should not make an exhibition of the living conditions of railway employees.

I think that it will meet everyone's wishes if we go back to Dr. HUYBERECHTS' suggestion, but I should prefer to leave more freedom of choice to the Governments by wording the sentence like this : « ... within the limits compatible with their national legislation. »

This should satisfy everyone without completely altering the original text of the Summary.

**The President.** — The Section doubtless will agree to put to the vote the amendments proposed by Messrs. BERTRAND and ENDICOTT first of all.

(*Agreed.*)

Does the Meeting think these two amendments should be combined ?

(*Agreed.*)

Will you please therefore vote upon these two amendments together.

— 28 members voted in favour of these amendments.

**The President.** — I will now ask you to vote on the amendment suggested by Mr. NOLET DE BRAUWERE.

**Mr. Nolet de Brauwere** (in French). — Mr. President, I would like to know the exact wording of the text we are going to vote upon.

**The President.** — The amendment you have to vote upon is the question of putting a full stop after the words « long periods » and deleting the remainder of the text.

**Mr. Nolet de Brauwere** (in French). — May I point out to you, Mr. President, that this completely alters the whole summary. While if Dr. HUYBERECHTS' suggestion is adopted everyone will be satisfied.

**The President.** — I now ask you to vote on the amendment suggested by Mr. NOLET DE BRAUWERE.

— 9 members voted in favour of this amendment.

**The President.** — The first amendment is therefore adopted.

The final wording of Summary No. 4 therefore reads as follows :

« 4. In order to ensure standards of comfort and living conditions, which are so often insufficient, it is desirable that the Administrations as well as the Governments or both together, help them to buy their own homes by means of a system of financing building societies and staff co-operatives, by direct or indirect loans to employees at the lowest possible rate of interest repayable over long periods. In those countries where it would be possible within the framework of existing legislation or custom to so arrange, further concessions are recommended by way of exemptions from or reductions in rates and taxes, by supply-

ing building sites free or at low cost, by requisitioning or long term leases together with transport facilities, supplying materials and technical supervision of the work. »

— *Adopted.*

**The President.** — We will now go on to Summary No. 5 which the Special Reporter will read.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — Here is the text of Summary No. 5 as I drew it up after reading the reports :

5. When economic conditions make it possible, it is desirable that railway staff housed by the Administrations should be housed rent free, and when this is not possible and a rent has to be charged, it should be as low as possible and as a rule lower than the rents charged for similar private property in the same locality.

**Mr. Comber.** — I realise once again that Summary 5 is intended to cover the conditions in all sorts of countries, but I would like to suggest the following amendment at the beginning of the Summary : « Where economic conditions make it possible it *may be desirable in certain countries where it is appropriate* that railway staff... »

**The President.** — I call upon Mr. FLAMENT.

**Mr. Flament** (in French). — First of all I would like to pay a tribute to the humane sentiments and fine social feelings which animated the Special Reporter in drawing up this part of Summary No. 5.

Its wording however evokes a certain number of reservations on our part and calls for remark from three points of view : professional, social, and technical.

Professionally speaking, the fact that it is stated that railway staff should be housed rent free is a danger to us. Those of us closely connected with the staff know what complications may arise from housing the staff rent free, especially under present conditions where the intrinsic value of any accommodation is very great, and the difficulties that may occur, especially in determining the value of the remuneration received by different grades of employees.

From the professional point of view again, it also seems to us that providing accommodation as visualised in the Summary falsifies the basic idea of a salary paid in return for services rendered, according to the job and the work done.

From the social point of view : at the present time more than ever before, the fact that accommodation is provided by the Railway is in itself a very considerable benefit and if the benefit of not having to pay any rent is added, it makes the unfairness and disparity of treatment between those employees who enjoy such a privilege and those who do not even greater. This also applies when the accommodation is not provided rent free but at a lower rent than current rents in the locality.

If a certain class of employee is given such appreciable financial benefits, there is a risk of real injustice.

Finally from the technical point of view : the fact that accommodation is provided rent free, or in any case at a very low rent, increases the Company's expenses. This should not be overlooked in view of the considerable financial difficulties from which most Railway Administrations are suffering at the present time.

To sum up, to facilitate the building

of houses, to avoid the unfairness which might result from too meticulous an application of the suggested Summaries, to keep salaries in their proper proportion, to keep the proper distinction between different grades which is essential on such a large undertaking as a railway, I suggest a less literal wording.

For example I would suggest the text might be worded as follows : « As far as economic conditions permit, it is desirable that accommodation provided by the Administration should be let to employees at as low a rent as possible. »

Such a summary may seem a little too simple, but I think it would at least have the advantage of showing the wish of the Section to fix rents not only as low as possible but in such a way that the railway companies concerned do not make them into professional benefits.

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — I am completely in agreement with the point of view expressed by our French colleague. The arguments he has put forward are very much to the point : the financial difficulties of railway undertakings are very far from being imaginary.

I think it is very difficult — perhaps even impossible — to embark upon a policy of building houses to be allocated to the staff rent free. Such a procedure would very soon have to come to a stop.

On the other hand from the moral point of view, I think it is a bad practice to provide employees with rent free accommodation. To my mind, this is incompatible with the dignity of a railway employee, whatever his grade may be. He can afford to rent a house. I except those cases in which he must live in a given place for service reasons. I think

it is desirable to ask him to pay rent, even though this may be extremely low. Moreover to house him rent free, is to make him to some extent a prisoner to his Company.

I am completely in agreement with Mr. FLAMENT's suggestion.

**A Delegate (India).** — The Summary as it stands introduces a discrimination between staff housed and staff not housed and I suggest a slight amendment : « When economic conditions make it possible it is desirable that railway staff housed by the Administration should, unless housed free, be charged as low a rent as possible. »

**Mr. Kahra** (in French). — I think we should make a distinction between Government Railways and private Companies.

It is possible that certain private Companies may in given cases be able to house their staff rent free. This is not so generally. I think the text might be modified as follows : « When economic conditions make it possible it is desirable that accommodation be provided at as low a rent as possible. »

**Mr. Corble, London & North Eastern Railway.** — Sirs, with reference to what has been said about the desirability of placing houses rent free and at low rents at the disposal of the staff, I would like to remind the delegates that a large number of railwaymen have purchased houses out of their own savings or are renting them from Local Authorities, etc., in the ordinary way of business and they would be penalized if their colleagues were given houses rent free or at very low rents.

**Mr. Bertrand** (in French). — Mr. President, after hearing the different speakers who have made remarks about this Summary, I wonder if we ought to take sides in this question. It appears from the discussions that certain colleagues are not in favour of rent free houses; most of us are in favour of low rents. Several Companies could not meet such a burden; most Governments would not agree to it.

Under these conditions I wonder if it would not be best to suppress the whole summary altogether.

It is possible that in certain countries the railways companies may have to consider the question of rent free accommodation. If we take up a firm position on this point, they may find it a hindrance. This would not be to the advantage of the staff of such railways.

**The President.** — What does the Special Reporter think ?

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — The reports received did not give clear and precise answers from all the Administrations on this subject.

Some prefer to house their staff rent free. I know there are some, even amongst the English Companies for example. There are also some in the Colonies. It is an attraction for recruiting the necessary staff. But I quite agree it is a very difficult problem, and opinions are very diverse.

I also agree that the text of Summary 5 may lead to certain complications, not only from the financial point of view, but also from the social point of view, especially in countries where the railways are nationalised and railway employees are considered as State employees.

I raised this point in drawing up my report, but I did it to prove the point by a manifest absurdity.

We should not meddle with the matter, and I agree with the suggestion that this summary be deleted.

**Mr. Nolet de Brauwere** (in French). — I am all the more in agreement with the suggestion made by the Special Reporter as in Belgium, for example, 60 % of the railway staff already own their own homes.

In this connection, I would like to draw attention to a little mistake in the table on page 524 of the April *Bulletin*, in column 4 where the percentage of employees living in their own property is given as 6 % for the Belgian National Railways. This must be 60 %.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — I would like to remind Mr. NOLET DE BRAUWERE that the percentage in question refers not to employees who own their own homes but to those who own them thanks to assistance from the Administration.

The figure of 6 % represents the number of employees who have bought their homes with the aid of the Administration.

**Mr. Kahra** (in French). — I think that if we retain Summary 5 we should change the order and put « houses at low rents » first and then as the second possibility « rent free ».

**Mr. Julien, Ministry of Public Works and Transport, France** (in French). — I formally support the suggestion that this summary be deleted.

We have decided on our policy in

France; the decision of the French Ministry of Public Works is exactly the opposite to what is stated in Summary No. 5.

**The President.** — There are therefore various suggestions that this summary be suppressed.

Will the Special Reporter tell us his opinion ?

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — Mr. President, I confirm what I said just now that I see no objection to suppressing it.

**The President.** — I will therefore ask you to vote on supressing this summary altogether.

— *The suppression of Summary 5 altogether was agreed.*

**The President.** — We will now examine Summary No. 6.

I call upon the Special Reporter.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — Summary No. 6 was based upon the fact that certain Administrations find themselves in difficulties at the present time owing to the fact that accommodation owned by them is not available for employees, either because there is none at places to which employees are sent for service reasons or because such houses where they exist are not available because the employees living in them will not give them up.

This may happen owing to the impossibility of finding other accommodation, so that retired employees will not give up the home they have occupied up to now, or the families of deceased employees refuse to give it up.

The rent restriction acts in force in most countries do not allow the Administration to get possession from such tenants. A psychological factor also comes into play. Consequently a great number of Administrations are experiencing difficulties because they have to find new accommodation since they cannot get rid of the former tenants.

This is covered by this summary. It is a problem which may not exist in all countries; that is why the wording was not made very imperative.

Here is the text :

6. When it is necessary for an employee of a certain category to live at his place of work, it is desirable that the Railway Administrations acquire or rent accommodation for him, when the employee is transferred to a place where no railway accommodation is available, or else he should be paid a lodging allowance to enable him to rent private accommodation in the district.

**The President.** — This point is open to discussion. I call upon Mr. BARNES.

**Mr. Barnes.** — It seems to me that this summary deals with two matters that have already been discussed at some length.

Firstly the matter of provision of houses by the Administrations. We have talked about this a good deal yesterday, and were at pains to find words in Summary 3 which were generally acceptable.

Summary 6 does not seem to me to introduce any fresh matter and I would suggest that it is not necessary to embark these discussions again.

Secondly the last few lines dealing with lodging allowances are closely linked with the discussions on Summary 5, and in view of the conclusion reached, it would seem to be inconsistent to recom-

mend the payment of lodging allowances here unless it is recommended in a purely temporary sense — an amount paid for a short time in order to give the employee time to look around for accommodation.

I do not think Summary 6 introduces anything new and it should be omitted.

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — I must admit, Gentlemen, that I am rather in the dark about the meaning of this Summary.

May I give you an example.

Let us take the case of a stationmaster, housed in accommodation belonging to the Administration who owing to promotion takes up a post where he is no longer housed by the railway. In such a case you are going to oblige the Administration to find a home for him, i.e. to buy or rent one for him.

I think this is going too far.

Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that a large number of Administrations already pay a special allowance to those of their employees who for service reasons have to live away from home.

I willingly associate myself with the suggestion made by our British colleague. I think we might come to regret having agreed a text which might be misunderstood.

I am therefore in favour of suppressing it altogether.

**The President.** — What does the Special Reporter say?

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — I would like to remind the Meeting that this Summary sums up the reports which I examined and the questions asked of each Administration.

That is why this question is dealt with in a summary. Certain Administrations have adopted this method. I quite agree however with the objections made to the wording. I would not in consequence be against the suppression of the summary altogether.

**The President.** — I will therefore put the suppression of this Summary to the vote.

— *The suppression of this summary altogether is approved.*

**The President.** — We now come to *Summary No. 7*. I call upon the Special Reporter.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — This summary is inspired by the shortage of housing in most countries, especially those ravaged by the war.

Certain Administrations, particularly in these countries, have drawn up a building programme. On the other hand, others have not done anything. I think everyone should draw up such a programme, if only to solve the difficulties encountered as regards labour and materials.

Here is the text of *Summary No. 7* (*new No. 5*) :

7. Owing to the shortage of houses in nearly every country, it is desirable that all the Administrations draw up building and reconstruction programmes to supply hygienic accommodation for railway employees in the future to the extent necessitated by service requirements, and to meet the economic needs of employees and their social obligations. This programme should not embrace too long a period, but be based on available resources of all kinds — materials, labour and finances.

**Mr. Comber.** — I would like to propose a simple alteration. Take out the word « all » and insert after the word « Administrations » « affected ».

**Mr. Flament (in French).** — I would like to ask the Special Reporter if the last sentence of Summary No. 7 altogether expresses the idea he had in mind.

He says in fact that « this programme should be a relatively short term one, taking into account... » Did not Mr. PINTO TEIXEIRA mean that the carrying out of the programme should be planned for a relatively short time ?

I think that when important work, such as housing, is under consideration, first of all a programme should be drawn up to cover as long a period as possible. Especially under present conditions where the housing shortage is almost world wide, the building of new houses should be speeded up as much as possible.

I think that the wording of the second sentence should begin as follows : « The carrying out of all or part of this programme according to its importance or its extent, should be... »

**Mr. Bertrand (in French).** — I would suggest a slight alteration in the wording; I think it would be better to say « preparing building programmes » instead of « drawing up building programmes ». For the rest, I quite agree with Mr. FLAMENT's remarks.

I think everyone would agree that we should say « this programme should be carried out *as quickly as possible*, taking into account... »

**Mr. Endicott.** — I would like to suggest that the last sentence be deleted as

I think the last few words in any case would govern the progress of the scheme. I suggest the following :

« A small programme capable of early competition is to be preferred to one of long term duration. »

I think these words would cover the point.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira (in French).** — There are Administrations who have not yet even now drawn up any programme. That is the first point. The second point is the carrying out of the programme. It is not possible to carry out a programme while none is in existence.

I think that if you agree to the suggestion I am going to make, the Summary can be agreed unanimously.

I quite agree with Mr. BERTRAND's suggestion regarding the correct wording.

To meet the other requirements, I suggest saying : « This programme should be drawn up and carried out as quickly as possible taking into account... » instead of « This programme should cover a relatively short term ».

I think this wording should please everyone.

**Mr. Endicott.** — I agree because this is really the translation of the proposal I made.

**The President.** — Will you please therefore vote on Summary 7 as amended by the Special Reporter, the text of which is as follows : « Owing to the shortage of houses in nearly every country, it is desirable that the Administrations affected draw up building and reconstruction programmes to supply hygienic accommodation for railway employees in the future to the extent neces-

sitated by service requirements, and to meet the economic needs of employees and their social obligations. This programme should be prepared and carried out in as short a time as possible, based on available resources of all kinds, i.e. materials, labour and finances. »

— *Adopted.*

**The President.** — We now come to *Summary No. 8.*

I call upon the Special Reporter.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — This summary concerns in particular those countries affected by the war. However a great many countries which were lucky enough to escape the world war are also interested in this question.

Here is the text of *Summary No. 8* (*new No. 6*) :

8. It is desirable that during the period that building materials and labour are in short supply and excessively dear, the Railway Administrations speed up the reconstruction of damaged houses and improve or convert old houses by building on the additional rooms needed together with bathrooms, main water and electricity, drains, etc.; so as to provide railway staff and their families with hygienic and comfortable conditions on up-to-date standards.

I must point out that the last part of this Summary also covers countries which were spared by the war. In fact it appears from the information received that many employees do not enjoy up-to-date hygienic conditions and modern comforts such as bath rooms, main water, electricity, etc.

I think it advisable to include a reference to this matter in the summary.

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — I suppose the beginning of the Summary

is concerned with the building of new houses.

Consequently I suggest we make matters quite clear and reword it as follows: « If the building of new houses proves to be impossible, it is desirable that Railway Administrations... »

Moreover I suggest we say « putting houses into good order » rather « the reconstruction of houses ».

**Mr. Barnes.** — I support the proposal made by our colleague Dr. HUYBERECHTS.

**Mr. Flament** (in French). — I wonder if it would not be simpler to express our joint ideas and reach the goal which the Special Reporter has aimed at, motivated by a social feeling to which I pay tribute, by deleting altogether the first three lines of this summary and beginning the text as follows: « It is desirable that Railway Administrations... »

I think we are all agreed that the recommendation in the second part of this summary is of universal value.

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — I agree; it would be much simpler.

**The President.** — What does the Special Reporter say ?

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — I agree with Dr. HUYBERECHTS' proposal to replace the words « reconstruction » by « putting into repair ».

I do not agree with the suggestion made by Mr. FLAMENT that the three first lines of the summary be deleted. We have already stated that either new houses must be built or damaged houses repaired.

From the information supplied in the

reports, it would appear that the greatest difficulty experienced by the Administrations lies in the shortage of materials, and the shortage of labour; there is also the financial side.

This is why the summary begins by the statement that « where it is not possible to find materials and labour in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices, it is desirable that Railway Administrations do everything possible to speed up the reconstruction... »

This sentence is as it were the foundation of this summary. If it is deleted, our reason for recommending the reconstruction of damaged houses will not be understood.

**Mr. Bertrand** (in French). — It seems to me that the two points of view might be reconciled if we began the summary as follows : « Side by side with the drawing up of a programme for new houses it is desirable... »

I would also like to suggest another modification : replacing the words « salle de bain » by « salle d'eau » which covers all sanitary arrangements.

**Mr. Nolet de Brauwere** (in French). — Just one remark concerning the wording of the text.

It is said in this summary « where it is not possible to find materials... etc. » and the Administrations are charged with finding these. Now if the Administrations cannot find them it is very probable, in fact certain, that other people also will not be able to obtain them.

I think it would therefore be advisable to make a slight alteration and make matters more precise by saying : « when it is difficult to find materials, labour, etc... »

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — In this case, I will go back to my original suggestion; make no mention of labour nor of materials. Let us just say : « if the building of new houses is out of the question for the time being. »

**Mr. Nolet de Brauwere** (in French). — « ... is difficult ». .

**Mr. Bertrand** (in French). — I think it is better to say « side by side with the building programme... »

**Mr. Nolet de Brauwere** (in French). — In my opinion it is better to say : « Until the new housing programme can be carried out... »

**The President**. — We will put it to the vote.

First of all, I will ask you to vote on the amendment just suggested by **MR. BERTRAND**.

Here is the first amendment : « Side by side with the building programme, it is desirable that the Administrations... »

— *Adopted.*

**The President**. — **MR. BERTRAND** suggests a second amendment : « salle d'eau » instead of « salle de bain ».

— *Adopted.*

**The President**. — I will now ask you to vote on the summary as a whole, the text of which reads as follows :

« 6. Side by side with the drawing up of programmes for building houses, it is desirable that the Railway Administrations speed up the reconstruction of damaged houses and improve or convert

old houses by building on the additional rooms needed together with bathrooms, main water and electricity, drains, etc.; so as to provide railway staff and their families with hygienic and comfortable conditions conforming to up-to-date standards. »

— Adopted.

**The President.** — This brings us to Summary No. 9 (*new No. 7*), which the Special Reporter will now read.

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — Summary 9 says nothing new. It is merely a statement of the necessity of dealing with this question.

However, I think everyone will agree that it is best to let the Administrations decide for themselves what steps should be taken.

In my opinion, it is not our place to make suggestions which might bind all the Administrations. That is why Summary No. 9 has been worded in general terms.

Here is the text :

9. In view of the moral and material interest the Railway has in obtaining a sufficient number of hygienic homes for its staff, it is desirable that each Administration set up a special department to deal with building, upkeep, management and allocation of staff accommodation, as far as possible in consultation with staff representatives.

**The President.** — I call upon Dr. HUYBERECHTS.

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — I have only a remark to make about the wording of the summary. We should say : « In view of the moral and material interest there is for the Railway Admin-

istrations in having available a sufficient number of satisfactory hygienic homes for their staff it is desirable... »

**Mr. Pinto Teixeira** (in French). — I agree.

**Mr. Hadcock, Buenos Ayres Great Southern Railway, Argentine.** — Owing to the fact that in certain countries the question of staff accommodation does not constitute a problem needing important services, it would perhaps be better to say that a special department or a special section would deal with this question. Therefore the word « or special section » should be added to the text.

**Mr. Comber.** — I propose to add after the words : « in each Administration » the word « affected ».

**A Delegate (India).** — I support the suggestion made by Mr. HADCOCK.

**Mr. Endicott.** — I would like to suggest that we adopt what has been suggested with the addition « ... where such does not now exist... » after the word « department ». I suggest this possibly in self-defence as I think perhaps the Special Reporter is impressed with the fact that all the Railway Administrations have a Department which deals with these matters; whereas this is probably not so as in some Administrations the work might not justify a Department solely to deal with such matters. The Estate Department of the Railway Companies in England are responsible for housing and its administration generally and also for collecting annual revenue of something over £ 5 000 000.

I would also like to point out that in the Table, page 523, of the April 1947

*Bulletin*, the figure of 32 562 should be corrected to 32 484.

**Mr. Lévi, French National Railways** (in French). — After hearing Mr. ENDICOTT, I believe it would be better to mention in the text « a special department ».

I suggest however to alter slightly this wording by saying « a department specially charged... ». In this case, it may be a department dealing also with other matters.

**The President.** — Mr. ENDICOTT has suggested an amendment stating « that each Administration affected set up a special department where such does not now exist. »

On the other hand Mr. LÉVI suggested saying « ... a department should be specially charged... »

Does everyone agree ?

— These two amendments were adopted.

**Mr. Peirani, French National Railways** (in French). — I should like to point out that all the summaries adopted have been of an administrative and social nature.

The replies of the different Administrations have dealt with some technical questions and it seems, if the Section agrees, that an additional Summary might also be discussed. This summary should mention, in a general manner, the steps to be taken for the research of technical solutions to be adopted in carrying out the building programme.

**Mr. Comber.** — I would like to suggest that this is rather outside the question, and I personally would prefer to leave

the Summaries in the well rounded form in which we left them.

**Mr. Barnes.** — I would like to support Mr. COMBER. If we depart on technicalities, the field is so wide and we are starting on it too late to do it justice.

**The President.** — I will ask the Meeting to vote on Mr. PEIRANI's suggestion.

— *The Meeting decided that this suggestion should not be retained.*

**The President.** — There remains to take the vote on *Summary No. 9 (new No. 7)* as a whole, the final wording of which reads as follows :

« 7. In view of the moral and material interest there is for the Railway Administrations in having available a sufficient number of satisfactory hygienic homes for their staff, it is desirable that each Administration affected set up a special department, where such does not now exist, to deal with building, upkeep, management and allocation of staff accommodation, as far as possible in consultation with staff representatives. »

— Adopted.

#### SPECIAL MOTION.

**The President.** — Dr. HUYBERECHTS will now put a special motion before the Meeting.

**Dr. Huyberechts** (in French). — Mr. President, Gentlemen, we have completed our work. The Summaries which we have just agreed are all inspired — and this is first and foremost a tribute to the Special Reporter — by a deep feeling of humanity.

Already at the opening meeting of the Congress the President of the International Railway Congress Association stressed the growing importance of social questions in the working of railways.

Consequently, I think it desirable that at the next Congress — and I hope everyone will agree about this — there should be a question on the agenda dealing more particularly with the social work carried out by Railway Administrations.

I want to suggest to you — and I hope you will assent to this — that we submit to the Permanent Commission which alone is competent to decide if the question can be included in the agenda of the next Congress, the following question :

« The interest the Railway Administrations would have in creating and developing autonomous medical and social services and to associate the staff in the management of such services. »

Let me explain myself. The social section includes several sub-sections, one of the most important of which is without doubt the medical section. In many countries, this section is known as Social Insurance.

It is my impression that the way medical and social services are carried out differ appreciably from one country to another. It would be very interesting I think to concentrate on this point and examine what our neighbours are doing. In this way each can profit by the experience of the others. The action of the Administrations themselves and those of the staff are also very different. In certain countries legislation is very Draconian, so that any autonomous society is

impossible. The latter are allowed in other countries. Finally there are countries where there is complete freedom. There are one sided arrangements whereby the Administration bears all the expenses, and others in which the staff shares them to a lesser or greater extent.

In brief, there is no doubt that it would be very interesting to examine the situation as a whole, on the basis of the experiences of the different Administrations, to ascertain the results of these experiences, and — if possible — to draw therefrom a certain number of main principles acceptable to everyone.

Consequently, I would ask the Meeting to say what it thinks about my suggestion.

**The President.** — Gentlemen, you have heard Dr. HUYBERECHTS' suggestion.

Are there any remarks ?

As no one has anything to say, I will put the suggestion to the vote.

— *Adopted unanimously.*

**The President.** — Dr. HUYBERECHTS' suggestion will therefore be put before the Permanent Commission for their final decision.

Gentlemen, we have now come to the end of our labours.

It remains for me to thank you all for the spirit of collaboration you have shown during the meetings.

In particular, I wish to thank our Special Reporter Mr. PINTO TEIXEIRA.

(*Loud applause.*)

The Meeting ended at 12.05.

## DISCUSSION AT THE PLENARY MEETING.

---

Meeting held on the 27th June 1947.

---

DR. W. MEILE, PRESIDENT, IN THE CHAIR.

GENERAL SECRETARIES : MR. P. GHILAIN AND DR. G. DREYER.

ASSISTANT GENERAL SECRETARY : MR. EYRE A. W. TURBETT.

---

Mr. Ghilain, General Secretary (in French). — We now come to Question IV; the Summaries adopted by the Section for this question were published in the *Daily Journal of the Session* No. 4 of the 27th June.

Mr. Ghilain read each of these summaries in turn.

— *Reading the text of the Summaries did not give rise to any remarks.*

The President (in French). — We will therefore consider the Summaries for Question IV as adopted.

### Summaries.

« 1. The question of housing railway staff is a social problem of primary importance from the national point of view, as well as a railway working problem.

« The solutions adopted in each country by different Railway Administrations, or in course of being adopted, vary from country to country and railway to railway, according to the social and economic conditions of each country and according to the material, labour and capital available to each Administration.

« 2. All the Administrations agree that it is most desirable to have employees housed comfortably and with certainty of tenure from the point of view of the efficiency, regularity and flexibility of the service, but they do not all consider it necessary for all members of the staff to be housed by the Railways.

« This is only considered essential on certain colonial railways and three other railways.

« 3. In carrying out the principles laid down in the foregoing summaries, the Railway Administrations should endeavour to place accommodation, when there are no reasons for not doing so, at the disposal of the employees whose permanent presence where they work is essential in the interest of the service, and to those whose presence where they work although not essential is none the less desirable.

« 4. In order to ensure standards of comfort and living conditions, which are so often insufficient, it is desirable that the Administrations as well as the Governments or both together, help them to buy their own homes by means of a system of financing building societies and staff co-operatives, by

« direct or indirect loans to employees  
 « at the lowest possible rate of interest  
 « repayable over long periods. In those  
 « countries where it would be possible  
 « within the framework of existing legis-  
 « lation or custom to so arrange, fur-  
 « ther concessions are recommended by  
 « way of exemptions from or reductions  
 « in rates and taxes, by supplying build-  
 « ing sites free or at low cost, by re-  
 « quisitioning or long term leases to-  
 « gether with transport facilities, supply-  
 « ing materials and technical supervision  
 « of the work.

« 5. Owing to the shortage of houses  
 « in nearly every country, it is desirable  
 « that the Administrations affected draw  
 « up building and reconstruction pro-  
 « grammes to supply hygienic accommo-  
 « dation for railway employees in the  
 « future to the extent necessitated by  
 « service requirements, and to meet the  
 « economic needs of employees and their  
 « social obligations. This programme  
 « should be prepared and carried out in  
 « as short a period as possible, based

« on available resources of all kinds, i.e.  
 « materials, labour and finances.  
 « 6. Side by side with the drawing up  
 « of programmes for building houses, it  
 « is desirable that the Railway Adminis-  
 « trations speed up the reconstruction of  
 « damaged houses and improve or con-  
 « vert old houses by building on the ad-  
 « ditional rooms needed together with  
 « bathrooms, main water and electricity,  
 « drains, etc.; so as to provide railway  
 « staff and their families with hygienic  
 « and comfortable conditions conform-  
 « ing to up-to-date standards.

« 7. In view of the moral and material  
 « interest there is for the Railway Ad-  
 « ministrations in having available a  
 « sufficient number of satisfactory hy-  
 « gienic homes for their staff, it is de-  
 « sirable that each Administration af-  
 « fected set up a special department,  
 « where such does not now exist, to deal  
 « with building, upkeep, management  
 « and allocation of staff accommodation,  
 « as far as possible in consultation with  
 « staff representatives. »

## ERRATUM

**Bulletin, August 1947**

**GENERAL LIST OF DELEGATES.**

(Lucerne Session.)

**II. MEMBERS APPOINTED BY ADHERENT GOVERNMENTS.**

*Page 730 : PAYS-BAS (NETHERLANDS). — Ministère du Waterstaat :*

*Instead of : ♦ G. Joustra, président du Personnel des Chemins de fer Néerlandais.*

*Please read : ♦ G. Joustra, président du Conseil de Personnel des Chemins de fer Néerlandais.*

## OFFICIAL INFORMATION

ISSUED BY THE

### PERMANENT COMMISSION

OF THE

### International Railway Congress Association

---

#### Revision of the Rules and Regulations of the Association.

---

At the Plenary Meeting on June 27th, 1947, the Lucerne Congress approved the proposal of the Permanent Commission of the Association, tending to revise Article 17 of the Rules and Regulations.

The object of this revision is to give to the Association a sounder financial situation by increasing from 100 Gold-francs to 200 Gold-francs the minimum contribution of member Organisations and for member Administrations to raise from 100 Gold-francs to 200 Gold-francs the fixed contribution and simultaneously to increase the maximum of the variable subscription to 1/3 Gold-franc per kilometre from the present maximum of 1/5 Gold-franc per kilometre. (See page 803 of the August 1947 *Bulletin*.)

In accordance with the Rules and Re-

gulations (Art. 22), a written ballot among the affiliated Railway Administrations, Organisations and Governments took place within the period laid down (6 months); the result of this ballot is quite affirmative, the votes received in favour of the proposal numbering 461 on a total of 474 votes received.

It should be noted that according to Article 22, the modifications are adopted when supported by two-thirds of the votes received at headquarters of the Permanent Commission by the end of this period.

The revised Rules and Regulations consequently came into force on December 28th, 1947, i.e. six months after the closure of the Lucerne Congress, and are worded as follows :

# Rules and Regulations of the International Railway Congress Association.

DECEMBER 1947.

## Objects, headquarters and constitution of the Association.

**ARTICLE 1.** — The object of the International Railway Congress Association is to facilitate the progress and development of railways by the holding of periodical Congresses and by means of publications.

The headquarters of the Association are at Brussels.

**ART. 2.** — The Association is composed of State Railway Administrations, and of Administrations directly concerned with the working of railways of public utility in countries which have joined the Association.

It is composed of the Railway Administrations included in the list which has been published in the *Bulletin of the Railway Congress* for September 1922, p. 1274.

The Governments of the countries to which the Association extends may also join the Association.

The list of these countries (see appendix) may be altered by a decision of the Permanent Commission, as stated in article 4.

International Organisations which deal essentially with railway operation may be admitted as adherents of the Association, as may also National Unions formed of administrations operating at least 5 000 kilometres (3 107 miles) of railways not belonging to the Association.

## Permanent Commission.

**ART. 3.** — The Association acts through a Permanent Commission composed of members nominated according to article 6.

**ART. 4.** — The Permanent Commission can, by a postal vote, giving a majority of three

quarters of the total membership, alter the list of countries belonging to the Association.

It has power to arrange for the admission of Organisations in a position to belong to the Association and of Railway Administrations, subject to a written report prepared by a member nominated in each case by the President.

The only Railway Administrations who may be admitted to the Association, beyond those who constituted it in 1922, are those whose principal business is the running of railways worked by mechanical traction, whether owned or leased by a public authority, open for public traffic and having a length of at least 100 kilometres (62 miles) open for traffic and average receipts per annum, over the last three years of at least two million gold francs (¹).

Administrations cease to belong to the Association if they fall within either of the following categories :

a) Undertakings which enter into liquidation or default and Railway Administrations which cease to operate their lines directly in the public service;

b) Members who have not paid their subscriptions for more than two years and who, having been duly notified, have not paid the arrears;

c) Railway Administrations admitted subsequently to the formation of the Association in 1922, which no longer fulfil the conditions laid down in the 3rd paragraph of this article.

(¹) In calculating the length of line, sections of mountain railway worked by special methods of haulage are taken as equivalent to twice their length.

The admission of an Administration in a State which itself is only provisionally included in the Association, under the terms of the 1st paragraph of this article, remains provisional until the admission of the State itself is confirmed.

ART. 5. — The Commission shall organise the Congress meetings, prepare an agenda for discussion, be responsible for their preliminary treatment, edit and publish reports for the discussions, draw up a balance sheet, fix, subject to article 17, the amount of the annual subscriptions, be responsible for the finances, and set on foot any investigations and issue any reports or other publications which will, in its judgment, further the objects of the Association.

ART. 6. — The Permanent Commission shall be composed of ex-presidents of the sessions of the Congress, ex-officio members, and elected members, the number of which shall be fixed by each Congress.

The elected members shall be, as far as possible, chosen to represent the different Nations. Under no circumstances shall any one Nation have more than nine elected members.

One third shall retire at each Congress and shall be eligible for re-election.

Members who have ceased to hold office of any kind, so that they are no longer attached to the railway service of an adherent Government, to an adherent Organisation or to a participating Administration which qualified them at the time of their election, shall cease to be members of the Permanent Commission. It shall be the duty of such a member at once to inform the president when he retires. The Permanent Commission may, upon the application of five members, with the consent of the majority of all its members consulted by letter, ask him to remain until the next Congress.

The Commission shall always have the power to complete its number by co-opting delegates of the participating Administrations and adherent Governments. In this case a final election shall be made at the following Congress.

When the place of meeting of a Congress has been fixed, the Permanent Commission shall have power to co-opt as temporary members representatives of the country in which the Congress is to be held.

ART. 7. — The Permanent Commission shall elect from among its members a president and two vice-presidents at its first meeting after each Congress of the Association.

The president and one of the vice-presidents shall be chosen from the Belgian members.

The Commission shall appoint a general secretary, a secretary-treasurer and secretaries. As such they shall have the right to attend the meetings in a consultative capacity.

The Commission shall be summoned by the President when the business of the Association requires it, but in any case at least once a year.

A meeting may be held when demanded by any five members.

Questions shall be decided by the votes of the majority of members present. If the votes are equal, the Chairman shall have the casting vote.

Minutes shall be kept of the proceedings of the Commission. Nine members shall form a quorum.

If at a first meeting this number is not present, the meeting shall be adjourned for not longer than one month, when it shall then be considered valid whatever may be the number of members present.

ART. 8. — The Association shall be represented in Courts of Justice and in all civil actions by the president, or in the event of his being unable to attend, by the general secretary of the Permanent Commission.

#### Executive Committee.

ART. 9. — At its first meeting after a Congress the Permanent Commission shall nominate three of its members, who, with the president and the vice-presidents of the Commission, shall form an Executive Committee.

The president of the Permanent Commission shall also be president of the Executive Committee.

The general secretary, the secretary-treasurer and the secretaries of the Commission shall be members of the Committee, and shall have the right to take part in discussions, but not to vote.

The members of the Executive Committee shall hold office for a period equal to the interval between two Congresses. They shall be eligible for re-election.

The Executive Committee shall meet at the instigation of the president on his own authority or at the request of three members.

The Committee shall be responsible for the management of current affairs and for financial business, also for superintending and managing investigations, reports and publications; for the editing of the *Bulletin* and for the care of the library and archives. It shall decide as to printing in whole or in part the reports and other documents submitted to a Congress, the circulation of which it regards as necessary to facilitate the discussions. It shall be the duty of the Committee to furnish members of the Association with such special information as they may require.

The Committee shall have the right to appoint and to dismiss the staff.

The carrying out of the decisions of the Committee is entrusted to the president and the general secretary.

#### Congresses.

**ART. 10.** — At each Congress the Association shall fix the time and place for the following Congress.

The Permanent Commission may alter such arrangements under exceptional circumstances.

**ART. 11.** — The following shall have a right to attend the meetings :

1) The members of the Permanent Commission, the secretaries and the secretary-treasurer;

2) Delegates appointed by the participating administrations and adherent Governments and Organisations.

These must belong to the regular and permanent staff of the delegating Administration;

3) The secretaries of sections, and the reporters appointed by the Permanent Commission or by the Executive Committee to report on the items on the agenda.

**ART. 12.** — The participating Railway Administrations shall be entitled to nominate a number of delegates in proportion to the mileage of their system in the following ratio :

One delegate for lines of not more than 200 km. (124 miles);

Two delegates for lines of 200 to 500 km. (124 to 311 miles);

One additional delegate for each additional 500 km. (311 miles) or fraction thereof above 500 up to 3 000 km. (1 864 miles);

One additional delegate for each additional 1 000 km. (621 miles) or fraction thereof above 3 000 up to 6 000 km. (1 864 up to 3 728 miles);

One additional delegate per 2 000 km. (1 242 miles) or fraction thereof above 6 000 up to 10 000 km. (3 728 up to 6.214 miles);

One additional delegate per 4 000 km. (2 485 miles) or fraction thereof above 10 000 km. (6 214 miles).

The adherent Governments and Organisations may nominate delegates to a maximum number of 10 in the proportion of one delegate for each 100 gold francs subscription up to 500 gold francs, and one additional delegate for each 250 gold francs over 500 gold francs.

The maximum figures quoted above do not include those members who take part in the Congresses in accordance with the 1st and 3rd paragraphs of article 11, and whom the participating Administrations, or adherent Governments and Organisations include amongst their delegates.

All delegates participate in the Congresses with equal rights.

ART. 13. — At the opening of each Congress the officers of the Permanent Commission shall hold office temporarily, and the Congress immediately elect its own officers as follows :

- 1) One or more honorary presidents and vice-presidents;
- 2) One president;
- 3) One or more general secretaries and one or more assistant secretaries.

The presidents of sections, elected as explained in article 14 following, shall also be included.

The delegate nominated first by each government shall be an ex-officio vice-president.

All officers shall be appointed for the duration of the Session.

The election shall take place according to the rules laid down in article 16, paragraph 6. The duties of the officers shall be those laid down by standing orders adopted by deliberative assemblies for the conduct of their proceedings.

After the appointment of the officers, the Congress shall resolve itself into sections, according to the arrangements of items on the agenda submitted by the Permanent Commission.

A member may enter his name for more than one section.

The Congress may also appoint special committees to investigate certain questions.

ART. 14. — Each section or committee shall appoint its own officers consisting of :

- 1) A president;
- 2) One or more vice-presidents;
- 3) One or more principal secretaries and secretaries.

The principal secretaries of each section or committee, however, shall be nominated by the Permanent Commission.

The sections and the special committees shall cease with the termination of each session.

ART. 15. — The discussions of the Congress shall be confined to the questions set down in the agenda for the session by the Perma-

gent Commission. The latter may receive suggestions, either as regards the inclusion of a question or relating to a particular question already raised by participants or adherents.

A reporter appointed by the Permanent Commission, shall prepare a brief outline of each question placed on the agenda, together with a resume of the documents he has been furnished with; he will not draw up the final summary.

No question shall be discussed at a general meeting without having been first considered by a section or special committee.

ART. 16. — The discussions shall be conducted in French and in the language of the country in which the Congress is held. Speeches in any other language shall be translated into French.

The minutes and reports shall be drawn up in French, but speakers on demand shall be entitled to have their original words reproduced.

The officials of the respective sections shall draw up an abstract of the discussions setting forth the various opinions expressed in the section. After receiving the approval of the section these abstracts shall be submitted to the general meeting. They shall then be inserted in the minutes after having been completed by the addition, if necessary, of any new opinions expressed at the general meeting itself.

The Congress shall not vote except on questions of management or organisation.

On these special questions, the votes of the majority of the members present shall be taken by members rising in their places. If there is any doubt the votes shall be counted. A roll call shall not be held except at the request of not less than twelve members.

#### Subscriptions and auditing of accounts.

ART. 17. — The expenses of the Congresses, of the Permanent Commission and of the Executive Committee shall be covered by :

- 1) The annual subscription of members;

**2) Subsidies and other casual receipts.**

The annual subscription shall consist of :

a) In the case of adherent Governments and Organisations, such an amount as they may decide, but which in the case of member Organisations shall not be less than 200 gold francs;

b) For the member Administrations, a fixed sum of 200 gold francs plus a sum proportionate to the length of the system. This variable sum is fixed by the Permanent Commission, but may not exceed *the third* of a gold franc per kilometre.

The financial year shall begin on the 1st January.

**ART. 18.** — Payment of the subscriptions entitles participating Administrations, Governments and adherent Organisations to receive free as many copies of reports, of the proceedings and other publications as the number of their delegates.

**ART. 19.** — The Permanent Commission shall present to each Congress a report on the financial position. The Congress shall appoint two auditors to pass the accounts.

**Revision of the constitution, dissolution and liquidation.**

**ART. 20.** — The rules may be revised by the Congress on the proposal of the Permanent Commission, due notice being given to the participants and adherents by a letter sent out at least two months before the opening of the session.

Proposals for modifications put forward by participants or adherents must reach the Permanent Commission at least six months before the opening of the session. If they are adopted by the Commission, they are submitted to the Congress by means of a report sent out by the Commission, which should be despatched to the participants and adherents at least two months before the opening of the session.

If the Permanent Commission does not accept a proposed modification, it shall not

be submitted to the Congress, unless it is supported in writing by participating Administrations or adherent Governments or Organisations entitled to be represented by 100 delegates at the Congress. In this case the proposition is submitted to the participants and adherents by a letter from the Permanent Commission sent out at least two months before the opening of the session.

**ART. 21.** — Every proposal for amending the rules shall be discussed by the Congress on a report of a special committee presided over by the President of the Permanent Commission, or by his delegate and composed of eleven members, as follows :

a) The President of the Permanent Commission or his delegate;

b) Four members delegated by the Permanent Commission;

c) One delegate from each of the five sections which form the Congress, this delegate being chosen after discussion of the suggestion by the section;

d) One delegate representing the authors of the suggestion.

**ART. 22.** — The proposed modification shall only be considered if it is supported by the clear majority of the delegates present at the general meeting.

The modification shall not be finally adopted until a written ballot has been taken, which shall be called for by a circular letter sent out by the Permanent Commission during the month following the termination of the session of the Congress. In this ballot each Administration, Government or Organisation belonging to the Association shall have a number of votes equal to the number of the delegates to which it is entitled.

The ballot shall be closed six months after the termination of the session of the Congress.

Only those modifications will be adopted which are supported by two-thirds of the votes received at headquarters of the Permanent Commission by the end of this period.

The results of the ballot will be published in the monthly *Bulletin* of the Association.

**ART. 23.** — Adherent Governments and Organisations, also participating Administrations constituting the Association pledge themselves to promote the meetings of the Congress and the work of the Permanent Commission.

**ART. 24.** — The Association may be dissolved only by a three quarters majority, on a postal vote from the participating Administrations, each one having a number of votes equal to that of the delegates to which it is entitled.

**ART. 25.** — In the event of dissolution, the Permanent Commission shall have authority to arrange the liquidation.

The assets of the Association are to be distributed by its agency among works conforming with the objects of the Association or among philanthropic works in connection with railways.

**ART. 26.** — In no circumstances shall participating Administrations and adherent Governments and Organisations who for any reason have ceased to belong to the Association, have any claim on the assets of the Association.

#### APPENDIX.

## LIST OF COUNTRIES

### included in the International Railway Congress Association.

Argentine;	Finland;	Mexico;
Austria;	France, Algeria, Tunisia,	Nicaragua;
Belgium and Colony;	Colonies and Protectorates;	Norway;
Bolivia;	Great Britain and North of	Paraguay;
Brazil;	Ireland, Dominions, Protectorates and Colonies;	Peru;
Bulgaria;	Greece;	Poland;
Chili;	Hayti;	Portugal and Colonies;
China;	Holland and Colonies;	Rumania;
Colombia;	Hungary;	Salvador;
Costa Rica;	India;	Siam;
Cuba;	Irish Free State;	Spain;
Czechoslovakia;	Italy;	Sweden;
Denmark;	Jugoslavia;	Switzerland;
Dominica;	Luxemburg;	Turkey;
Ecuador;		United States of America;
Egypt;		Uruguay.